A U M

He who knows the bliss of that Brahman, from whence all speech, with the mind, turns away unable to reach it, fears nothing. He does not distress himself with the thought, Why did I not do what is good, or what is bad? He who knows these two, good and bad, frees himself.—*Taittriyaka-Upanishad.*

But those in whom dwell penance, abstinence, and truth, to them belongs that pure world of Brahma, to them namely, in whom there is nothing crooked, nothing false, and no guile. He who has known the origin, the entry, the place, the fivefold distribution and the internal state of the life force, obtains immortality.—*Prasna-Upanishad.*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. IV AUGUST, 1916 No. 10

No Theosophical Society, as such, is responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

Where any article, or statement, has the author's name attached, he alone is responsible, and for those which are unsigned, the Editors will be accountable.

THE BHAGAVAD-GITA

CHAPTER XII.

DEVOTION BY MEANS OF FAITH.

BY A STUDENT OF W. Q. J.

THE word "faith" as used in this connection has a far deeper meaning than is usually given it. To have faith, is the holding of a conviction of the truth of that upon which one's faith is fixed. There are many "faiths" in the world, some adopted because of ignorance, credulity and superstition; others, because they appeal to the desires of their adherents; others again, because of the partial truths they hold. That which is lacking in all of these is "knowledge", for a conviction held in ignorance only perpetuates ignorance and its results; a conviction held from desire, only perpetuates desires and their results; a conviction held because of partial truths perceived indicates a little knowledge, but not enough to distinguish the error that is always mixed with partial truths. The "faith" spoken of by Krishna is that which is founded on self-knowledge—or knowledge of the Self as being All, and in All. A reliance upon that Supreme Self, and an identification of one's Self with It, presents an unchanging and unchangeable basis from which the Truth in regard to Man and all Nature may be perceived. "True faith" can only exist when founded upon right knowledge.

In the reply of Krishna which closes the eleventh chapter, these words are found: "I am to be approached and seen and known in truth by means of that devotion which has me alone as

an object". Arjuna follows in the twelfth chapter with the question: "Among those of thy devotees who always *thus* worship thee, which take the better way, those who worship the indivisible and unmanifested, or those who serve thee as thou now art?"

Krishna's reply embodies the following: "For those whose hearts are fixed on the unmanifested the labor is greater, because the path which is not manifest is with difficulty attained by corporeal beings". A foot-note explains that "The difficulty here stated is that caused by the personality, which causes us to see the Supreme as different and separate from ourselves". The tendency of human beings is to think and act as persons in their relations with other human beings and with manifested nature in general, and although they may ardently desire to act "for and as the Self", they find themselves constantly falling under the sway of the purely personal *feeling* of separateness.

The words "Or those who serve thee as thou now art", refer to the form in which Krishna was best known to Arjuna. That this was a human form is indicated in the previous chapter, where Arjuna says, "Having been ignorant of thy majesty, I took thee for a friend, and have called thee 'O Krishna, O Son of Yadu, O Friend', and blinded by my affection and presumption, I have at times treated thee without respect, in sport, in recreation, in thy chair, and at thy meals, in private and in public; all this, I beseech you, O inconceivable being, to forgive." In this sentence Arjuna recognizes Krishna as a divine incarnation, a being who had reached perfection and who had voluntarily incarnated in order to help those still struggling in "this ocean of incarnations and death". That such divine incarnations have not been infrequent, both before and since the time of Krishna, is shown by a study of the world's great religions; the rationale and meaning of such incarnations is clearly shown in the "Secret Doctrine".

The course of every Arjuna—and each one of us is just that—is first a recognition that true knowledge must exist, and an ardent desire to obtain that knowledge. Then comes a search for the source of that knowledge; in that search lies the danger for the seeker. He finds many teachers, each with a separate claim to knowledge. While as yet he has no means of determining the true from the false, he will accept ignorantly that teacher or teaching which accords with his ideas and desires. This unfortunately is the course of most seekers. But there are to be found others who examine carefully the fundamental bases of the teachings offered, and who will accept *only that one* whose foundational propositions can be so universally applied that their truth becomes self-evident.

A resumé of the previous chapters will show that Krishna pointed out to Arjuna the various forms of belief and practice—or devotion—followed by men, and that these, though partial and erroneous, would finally lead to the one Truth if the seeker was sincere and devoted in his search for it. At the same time the One Reality or Truth was shown to be accessible to all men, and

to be the highest, most direct and noblest path, leading to understanding, wisdom and true happiness.

"But if thou shouldst be unable *at once steadfastly* to fix thy heart and mind on me, strive then O Dhananjaya, to find me by constant practice in devotion." Steadfastness is gained by a constant endeavor to become steadfast.

"If after constant practice, thou art still unable, follow me by actions performed for me; for by doing works for me thou shalt attain perfection". The works referred to are special ones, designed and performed for the sake of the Supreme, all tending towards an elimination of the "personal idea" of separateness.

"But if thou art unequal even to this, then, being self-restrained, place all thy works, failures and successes alike, on me, abandoning in me the fruit of every action. For knowledge is better than constant practice, meditation is superior to knowledge, renunciation of the fruit of action to meditation; final emancipation immediately results from such renunciation". It has been said that the Source of all beings is One; that the goal is One; but that the Path varies with each pilgrim. Hence each pilgrim is at a point of evolution or development where one or other of the steps presented is within reach. Each of these steps is shown to be leading in the direction of the goal, but the aspirant must see them as only steps, the condition of his success being that he must ever keep the goal—union with the Higher Self—in view.

"Being self-restrained", means holding the personal self in abeyance. "Place all thy works, failures and successes alike, on me, abandoning in me the fruit of every action", hardly needs an explanation; for the same instruction has been given so often in previous chapters of the Gita, such as—"Freedom comes from a renunciation of self-interest in the fruit of one's actions". Self-interest is always a matter of thinking; we can have no attachment for anything that we do not think about, nor can we have any dislike for a thing we do not think about; so if we find confronting us things right to be done, we should do them, regardless of whether they promise success or failure to ourselves. Krishna says that final emancipation immediately results from such renunciation, thus placing complete renunciation as attainment of the goal. Renunciation is superior to meditation, because it is by meditation upon the end in view that renunciation comes; meditation is superior to knowledge because right knowledge produces right meditation; knowledge is better than constant practice, because practice begets knowledge.

The remainder of the chapter should be read in connection with these notes, for there Krishna speaks of the qualities possessed by those who follow the path he shows. The chapter ends with these words, "But those who seek this sacred ambrosia—the religion of immortality—even as I have explained it, full of faith, intent on me above all others, and united to devotion, are my most beloved."

TRANSACTIONS OF THE BLAVATSKY LODGE

OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

DISCUSSIONS OF THE STANZAS OF THE FIRST VOLUME OF THE "SECRET DOCTRINE."

(Continued from July)

The "Transactions" were compiled from shorthand notes taken at the meetings of the Blavatsky Lodge of the Theosophical Society, January 10th to June 20th, 1889, and later printed in pamphlet form. Copies of this pamphlet are getting rarer with every year. THEOSOPHY is therefore reprinting the "Transactions" for the benefit of present-day students. Part I consists of discussions of Stanzas I and II of the *"Book of Dzyan,"* upon which *"The Secret Doctrine"* is based. The answers to the questions were given by H. P. Blavatsky. Students not possessing *"The Secret Doctrine,"* will find that these Stanzas are also printed in H. P. Blavatsky's *"Voice of the Silence,"* which is owned by most students, or can be purchased, through THEOSOPHY, at the nominal price of seventy-five cents, postpaid. The first installment of the "Transactions" was printed in the June issue of THEOSOPHY.

III.

STANZA I. *(continued).*

Sloka (5).—DARKNESS ALONE FILLED THE BOUNDLESS ALL, FOR FATHER, MOTHER, AND SON WERE ONCE MORE ONE, AND THE SON HAD NOT AWAKENED YET FOR THE NEW WHEEL AND HIS PILGRIMAGE THEREON.

Q. Is "Darkness" the same as the "Eternal Parent Space" spoken of in Sloka (I)*?*

A. Not at all. Here "the boundless all" is the "Parent Space;" and Cosmic Space is something already with attributes, at least potentially. "Darkness," on the other hand, and in this instance, is that of which no attributes can be postulated: it is the Unknown Principle filling Cosmic Space.

Q. Is Darkness, then, used in the sense of the opposite pole to Light?

A. Yes, in the sense of the Unmanifested and the Unknown as the opposite pole to manifestation, and that which falls under the possibility of speculation.

Q. Darkness is not opposed to Light, then, but to differentiation; or rather, may it not be taken as the symbol of Negativeness?

A. The "Darkness" here meant can be opposed to neither Light nor Differentiation, as both are the legitimate effects of the Manvantaric evolution—the cycle of Activity. It is the "Darkness upon the face of the Deep," in *Genesis:* Deep being here "the bright son of the Dark Father"—Space.

Secret Doctrine references are to the Original Edition.—[ED. THEOSOPHY].

Q. Is it that there is no Light or simply nothing to manifest, and no one to perceive it?

A. Both. In the sense of objectivity, both light and darkness are illusions—*maya;* in this case, it is not Darkness as absence of Light, but as one incomprehensible primordial Principle, which, being Absoluteness itself, has for our intellectual perceptions neither form, colour, substantiality, nor anything that could be expressed by words.

Q. When does Light proceed from that Darkness?

A. Subsequently, when the first hour for manifestation strikes.

Q. Light, then, is the first manifestation?

A. It is, after differentiation has begun and at the third stage of evolution only. Bear in mind that in philosophy we use the word "light" in a dual sense: one to signify eternal, absolute light, *in potentia*, ever present in the bosom of the unknown Darkness, coexistent and coeval with the latter in Eternity, or in other words, identical with it; and the other as a Manifestation of heterogeneity and a contrast to it. For one who reads the Vishnu Purâna, for instance, understandingly, will find the difference between the two terms well expressed in Vishnu; one with Brahmâ, and yet distinct from him. There, Vishnu is the eternal x, and at the same time every term of the equation. He is Brahma (neuter) essentially matter and Spirit, which are Brahma's two primordial aspects—Spirit being the abstract light.* In the Vedas, however, we find Vishnu held in small esteem, and no mention made whatever of Brahmâ (the male.)

Q. What is the meaning of the sentence, "Father, Mother and Son were once more one"?

A. It means that the three Logoi—the unmanifested "Father," the semi-manifested "Mother" and the Universe, which is the third *Logos* of our philosophy or Brahmâ, were during the (periodical) *pralaya* once more *one;* differentiated essence had rebecome undifferentiated. The sentence, "Father, Mother, and Son," is the antitype of the Christian type—Father, Son and Holy Ghost—the last of which was, in early Christianity and Gnosticism, the female "Sophia." It means that all creative and sensitive forces and the effects of such forces which constitute the universe had returned

---

*In the second chapter of the Vishnu Purâna (Wilson's translation) we read—"Parasâra said: Glory to the unchangeable, holy, eternal supreme Vishnu, of one universal nature, the mighty over all: to him who is Hiranyagarbha, Hari, and Sankara, the creator, preserver, and destroyer of the world; to Vâsudeva, the liberator of his worshippers; to him whose essence is both single and manifold; who is both subtile and corporeal, indiscrete and discrete; to Vishnu the cause of final emancipation. Glory to the Supreme Vishnu the cause of the creation, existence, and end of this world; who is the root of the world, and who consists of the world."

And again: "Who can describe him who is not to be apprehended by the senses: who is the best of all things; the supreme soul, self-existent: who is devoid of all the distinguishing characteristics of complexion, caste, or the like; and is exempt from birth, vicissitude, death or decay: who is always and alone: who exists everywhere, and in whom all things here exist; and who is thence named Vasudeva? He is Brahma (neuter), supreme, lord, eternal, unborn, imperishable, undecaying; of one essence; ever pure, as free from defects. He, that Brahma was (is) all things; comprehending in his own nature the indiscrete and discrete."

to their primordial state: *all* was merged into one. During the Mahapralayas naught but the Absolute is.

Q. What are the different meanings of Father, Mother and Son? In the Commentary, they are explained as (a) Spirit, Substance and Universe, (b) Spirit, Soul and Body, (c) Universe, Planetary Chain and Man.

A. I have just completed it with my extra definition, which is clear, I think. There is nothing to be added to this explanation, unless we begin to anthropomorphise abstract conceptions.

Q. Taking the last terms of the three series, do the ideas Son, Universe, Man, Body correspond with one another?

A. Of course they do.

Q. And are these terms produced from the remaining pair of terms of each trinity; for instance, the Son from the Father and Mother, the men from the Chain and the Universe, etc., etc., and finally in Pralaya is the Son merged back again into its parents?

A. Before the question is answered, you must be reminded that the period preceding so-called Creation is not spoken about; but only that when matter had begun to differentiate, but had not yet assumed form. Father-Mother is a compound term which means primordial Substance or Spirit-matter. When from Homogeneity it begins through differentiation to fall into Heterogeneity, it becomes positive and negative; thus from the "Zero-state" (or *layam*) it becomes active and passive, instead of the latter alone; and, in consequence of this differentiation (the resultant of which is evolution and the subsequent Universe),—the "Son" is produced, the Son being that same Universe, or manifested Kosmos, till a new *Mahapralaya*.

Q. Or—the ultimate state in layam, *or in the zero point, as in the beginning before the stage of the Father, Mother and Son?*

A. There is but slight reference to that which was before the Father-Mother period in the *Secret Doctrine*. If there is Father-Mother, there can, of course, be no such condition as Laya.

Q. Father, Mother are therefore later than the Laya condition?

A. Quite so; individual objects may be in Laya, but the Universe cannot be so when Father-Mother appears.

Q. Is Fohat one of the three, Father, Mother and Son?

A. Fohat is a generic term and used in many senses. He is the *light* (Daiviprakriti) of all the three *logoi*—the personified symbols of the three *spiritual stages* of Evolution. Fohat is the aggregate of all the spiritual creative ideations *above*, and of all the electro-dynamic and creative forces *below*, in Heaven and on Earth. There seems to be great confusion and misunderstanding concerning the First and Second Logos. The first is the already present yet still unmanifested potentiality in the bosom of Father-Mother; the Second is the abstract collectivity of creators called "Demiurgi" by the Greeks or the Builders of the Universe. The *third logos* is the ultimate differentiation of the Second and the

individualization of Cosmic Forces, of which Fohat is the chief; for Fohat is the synthesis of the Seven Creative Rays or Dhyan Chohans which proceed from the third Logos.

Q. During Manvantara when the Son is in existence or awake, does the Father-Mother exist independently or only as manifested in the Son?

A. In using the terms Father, Mother, and Son, we should be on our guard against anthropomorphising the conception; the two former are simply centrifugal and centripetal forces and their product is the "Son"; moreover, it is impossible to exclude either of these factors from the conception in the Esoteric Philosophy.

Q. If so then comes this other point: it is possible to conceive of centripetal and centrifugal forces existing independently of the effects they produce. The effects are always regarded as secondary to the cause or causes.

A. But it is very doubtful whether such a conception can be maintained in, and applied to, our Symbology; if these forces exist they must be producing effects, and if the effects cease, the forces cease with them, for who can know of them?

Q. But they exist as separate entities for mathematical purposes, do they not?

A. That is a different thing; there is a great difference between nature and science, reality and philosophical symbolism. For the same reason we divide man into seven principles, but this does not mean that he has, as it were, seven skins, or entities, or souls. These principles are all aspects of one principle, and even this principle is but a temporary and periodical ray of the One eternal and infinite Flame or Fire.

Sloka (6).—THE SEVEN SUBLIME LORDS AND THE SEVEN TRUTHS HAD CEASED TO BE, AND THE UNIVERSE, THE SON OF NECESSITY, WAS IMMERSED IN PARANISHPANNA *(absolute perfection, Paranirvana, which is Yong-Grüb)*, TO BE OUTBREATHED BY THAT WHICH IS AND YET IS NOT. NAUGHT WAS.

Sloka (7).—THE CAUSES OF EXISTENCE HAD BEEN DONE AWAY WITH; THE VISIBLE THAT WAS, AND THE INVISIBLE THAT IS, RESTED IN ETERNAL NON-BEING, THE ONE BEING.

Q. If the "Causes of Existence" had been done away with, how did they come again into existence? It is stated in the Commentary that the chief cause of existence is "the desire to exist," but in the sloka, the universe is called the "son of necessity."

A. "The causes of existence had been done away with" refers to the last Manvantara, or age of Brahmâ, but the cause which makes the Wheel of Time and Space run into Eternity, which is out of Space and Time, has nothing to do with finite causes or what we call Nidânas. There seems to me no contradiction in the statements.

Q. There certainly is a contrast. If the causes of existence had been done away with, how did they come into existence again? But the answer removes the difficulty, for it is stated that one Manvantara had disappeared into Pralaya, and that the cause which led the previous Manvantara to exist is now behind the limits of Space and Time, and therefore causes another Manvantara to come into being.

A. Quite so. This one eternal and therefore, "causeless cause" is immutable and has nothing to do with the causes on any of the planes which are concerned with finite and conditioned being. The cause can therefore by no means be a finite consciousness or desire. It is an absurdity to postulate desire or necessity of the Absolute; the striking of a clock does not suggest the desire of the clock to strike.

Q. But the clock is wound up, and needs a Winder?

A. The same may be said of the universe and this cause, the Absolute containing both clock and Winder, once it is the Absolute; the only difference is that the former is wound up in Space and Time and the latter out of Space and Time, that is to say in Eternity.

Q. The question really requests an explanation of the cause, in the Absolute, of differentiation?

A. That is outside the province of legitimate speculation. Parabrahm is not a cause, neither is there any cause that can compel it to emanate or create. Strictly speaking, Parabrahm is not even the Absolute but *Absoluteness*. Parabrahm is not the cause, but the causality, or the propelling but not volitional power, in every manifesting Cause. We may have some hazy idea that there is such a thing as this eternal Causeless Cause or Causality. But to define it is impossible. In the *"Lectures on the Bhagavat Gîta,"* by Mr. Subba Row, it is stated that logically even the First Logos cannot cognize Parabrahm, but only Mulaprakriti, its veil. When, therefore, we have yet no clear idea of Mulaprakriti, the first basic aspect of Parabrahm, what can we know of that Supreme Total which is veiled by *Mulaprakriti* (the root of nature or Prakriti) even to the Logos.

Q. What is the meaning of the expression in sloka (7), "the visible that was, and the invisible that is"?

A. "The visible that was" means the universe of the past Manvantara which had passed into Eternity and was no more. "The invisible that is" signifies the eternal, ever-present and ever-invisible deity, which we call by many names, such as abstract Space, Absolute Sat, etc., and know, in reality, nothing about it.

Sloka (8).—ALONE THE ONE FORM OF EXISTENCE STRETCHED, BOUNDLESS, INFINITE, CAUSELESS, IN DREAMLESS SLEEP; AND LIFE PULSATED UNCONSCIOUS IN UNIVERSAL SPACE, THROUGHOUT THAT ALL-PRESENCE WHICH IS SENSED BY THE "OPENED EYE" OF THE DANGMA.

Q. Does the "Eye" open upon the Absolute: or are the "one form of existence" and the "All-Presence" other than the Absolute, or various names for the same Principle.

A. It is all one, of course; simply metaphorical expressions. Please notice that the "Eye" is not said to *"see"*; it only "sensed" the "All-Presence."

Q. It is through this "Eye" then, that we receive such sense, or feeling, or consciousness?

A. Through that "Eye," most decidedly; but then one must have such an "Eye" before he can see, or become a *Dangma,* or a Seer.

Q. The highest spiritual faculty, presumably?

A. Very well; but where, at that stage, was the happy possessor of it? There was no Dangma to sense the "All-Presence," because there were as yet no men.

Q. With reference to sloka (6), it was stated that the cause of Light was Darkness?

A. Darkness has, here again, to be read in a metaphorical sense. It is Darkness most unquestionably to our intellect, inasmuch as we can know nothing of it. I told you already that neither Darkness nor Light are to be used in the sense of opposites, as in the differentiated world. Darkness is the term which will give rise to least misconceptions. For instance, if the term "Chaos" were used, it would be liable to be confounded with chaotic matter.

Q. The term light was, of course, never used for physical light?

A. Of course not. Here light is the first potentiality awakening from its *laya* condition to become a potency; it is the first flutter in undifferentiated matter which throws it into objectivity and into a plane from which will start manifestation.

Q. Later on in the "Secret Doctrine," it is stated that light is made visible by darkness, or rather that darkness exists originally, and that light is the result of the presence of objects to reflect it, that is of the objective world. Now if we take a globe of water and pass an electric beam through it, we shall find that this beam is invisible, unless there are opaque particles in the water, in which case, specks of light will be seen. Is this a good analogy?

A. It is a very fair illustration, I believe.

Q. Is not Light a differentiation of vibration?

A. So we are told in Science; and Sound is also. And so we see that the senses are to a certain extent interchangeable. How would you account, for instance, for the fact that in trance a clairvoyant can read a letter, sometimes placed on the forehead, at the soles of the feet, or on the stomach-pit?

Q. That is extra sense.

A. Not at all; it is simply that the sense of seeing can be interchanged with the sense of touch.

Q. But is not the sense of perception the beginning of the sixth sense?

A. That is going beyond the present case, which is simply the interchanging of the senses of touch and sight. Such clairvoyants, however, will not be able to tell the contents of a letter which they have not seen or been brought into contact with; this requires the exercise of the sixth sense, the former is an exercise of senses on the physical plane, the latter of a sense on a higher plane.

Q. It seems very probable from physiology that every sense may be resolved into the sense of touch, which may be called the co-ordinating sense. This deduction is made from embryological research, which shows that the sense of touch is the first and primary sense, and that all the rest are evolved from it. All the senses, therefore, are more highly specialised or differentiated forms of touch.

A. This is not the view of Eastern philosophy; in the *Anugita,* we read of a conversation between "Brahman" and his wife concerning the senses, seven are spoken of, "mind and understanding" being the other two, according to Mr. Trimbak Telang and Professor Max Müller's translation; these terms, however, do not convey the correct meaning of the Sanskrit terms. Now, the first sense, according to the Hindus, is connected with sound. This can hardly be the sense of touch.

Q. By touch most probably sensibility, or some sense medium, is meant?

A. In the Eastern philosophy, however, the sense of sound is first manifested, and next the sense of sight, sounds passing into colours. Clairvoyants can *see* sounds and detect every note and modulation far more distinctly than they would by the ordinary sense of sound—vibration, or hearing.

Q. Is it, then, that sound is perceived as a sort of rhythmic movement?

A. Yes; and such vibrations can be seen at a greater distance than they can be heard.

Q. But supposing the physical hearing were stopped, and a person perceived sounds clairvoyantly, could not this sensation be translated into clairaudience as well?

A. One sense must certainly merge at some point into the other. So also sound can be translated into taste. There are sounds which taste exceedingly acid in the mouths of some sensitives, while others generate the taste of sweetness, in fact, the whole scale of senses is susceptible of correlations.

Q. Then there must be the same extension of the sense of smell?

A. Very naturally, as has been already shown before. The senses are interchangeable once we admit correlation. Moreover they can all be intensified or modified very considerably. You will now understand the reference in the *Vedas* and *Upanishads,* where sounds are said to be perceived.

Q. There was a curious story in the last number of Harper's Magazine of a tribe on an island in the South Seas which have

virtually lost the art and habit of speaking and conversing. Yet, they appeared to understand one another and see plainly what each other thought.

A. Such a "Palace of Truth" would hardly suit modern society. However, it was by just such means that the early races are said to have communicated with one another, thought taking an objective form, before speech developed into a distinct spoken language. If so, then there must have been a period in the evolution of the human races when the whole Humanity was composed of sensitives and clairvoyants.

ABOUT DEVACHAN*

I understand Devachan to be a state in which the highest ideal of the late personality is attained. H. P. B. says, "He who has placed himself beyond the veil of maya or illusion can have no Devachan." Is it then to be understood that the farther advanced the Ego in the knowledge of Truth, and the closer it come into communion with the one Great Truth, the less need it has for that dreamlike state, Devachan?

W. Q. Judge.—I never heard that in Devachan the "highest ideal of the late personality is attained." Were that so the question would answer itself. I have therefore to drop the first statement when considering the question. Attainment of "highest ideals" is only possible when one is above all illusions; certainly devachan furnishes no such condition. There the soul pursues its highest ideals spiritually, and, seeming to carry those all out to highest perfection, it is benefitted, enlarged and strengthened. Devachan is for rest and recuperation and not for action. Not alone do evil and mediocre people go to Devachan, but preëminently those who have high and deep—though unfulfilled—aspirations. These are artists, musicians, dreamers, religious enthusiasts. And they, having impetuous thoughts, stay there longer than others.

But those who have been through all those experiences here and in Devachan, and who have triumphed over illusion through self-conquest, do not need devachan because they have grown to their full strength and cannot against their wish be thrust into it by natural force. So they do not become subject to it. But that is the Adept. And he can enter into the devachanic state of another so as to help and benefit the other. We are not such as yet, but may perhaps some day, in the distant future, be able to do such great and altruistic work.

---

* This answer by Mr. Judge to the question asked was first printed in *The Theosophical Forum* of December, 1895. The title used is our own [Ed. Theosophy.]

THE BABEL OF MODERN THOUGHT*

Go to, let us go down and there confound their language that they may not understand one another's speech . . .

Genesis xi.

II.

HAVING done with modern physical Sciences we next turn to Western philosophies and religions. Every one of these is equally based upon, and derives its theories and doctrines from heathen, and moreover, *exoteric* thought. This can easily be traced from Schopenhauer and Mr. Herbert Spencer, down to Hypnotism and so-called "Mental Science". The German philosophers modernize Buddhism; the English are inspired by Vedantism; while the French, borrowing from both, add to them Plato, in a Phrygian cap, and occasionally, as with Auguste Comte, the weird sex-worship of Mariolatry of the old Roman Catholic ecstatics and visionaries. New systems, yclept philosophical, new sects and societies, spring up now-a-days in every corner of our civilized lands. But even the highest among them agree on no one point, though each claims supremacy. This, because no science, no philosophy—being at best, but a fragment broken from the WISDOM RELIGION—can stand alone, or be complete in itself. Truth, to be complete, must represent an unbroken continuity. It must have no gaps, no missing links. And which of our modern religions, sciences or philosophies, is free from such defects? Truth is One. Even as the palest reflection of the Absolute, it can be no more dual than is absoluteness itself, nor can it have *two* aspects. But such truth is not for the majorities, in our world of illusion—especially for those minds which are devoid of the *noëtic* element. These have to substitute for the high spiritual and *quasi* absolute truth the relative one, which having two sides or aspects, both conditioned by appearances, lead our "brain-minds"—one to intellectual scientific materialism, the other to materialistic or anthropomorphic religiosity. But even that kind of truth, in order to offer a coherent and complete system of something, has, while naturally clashing with its opposite, to offer no gaps and contradictions, no broken or missing links, in the special system or doctrine it undertakes to represent.

And here a slight digression must come in. We are sure to be told by some, that this is precisely the objection taken to theosophical expositions, from *Isis Unveiled* down to the *Secret Doctrine*. Agreed. We are quite prepared to confess that the latter work, especially, surpasses in these defects all the other theosophical works. We are quite ready to admit the faults charged against it by its critics—that it is badly arranged, discursive, over-burdened

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for February, 1891.

with digressions into by-ways of mythology, etc., etc. But then it is neither *a* philosophical system nor *the* Doctrine, called secret or esoteric, but only a record of a few of its facts and a *witness* to it. It has never claimed to be the *full* exposition of the system (it advocates) in its totality; (*a*) because as the writer does not boast of being a great Initiate, she could, therefore, never have undertaken such a gigantic task; and (*b*) because had she been one, she would have divulged still less. It has never been contemplated to make of the sacred truths an integral system for the ribaldry and sneers of a profane and iconoclastic public. The work does not pretend to set up a series of explanations, complete in all their details, of the mysteries of Being; nor does it seek to win for itself the name of a distinct system of thought—like the works of Messrs. Herbert Spencer, Schopenhauer or Comte. On the contrary the *Secret Doctrine* merely asserts that a system, known as the Wisdom Religion, the work of generations of adepts and seers, the sacred heirloom of pre-historic times—actually exists, though hitherto preserved in the greatest secrecy by the present Initiates; and it points to various corroborations of its existence to this very day, to be found in ancient and modern works. Giving a few fragments only, it there shows how these explain the religious dogmas of the present day, and how they might serve Western religions, philosophies and science, as sign-posts along the untrodden paths of discovery. The work is essentially fragmentary, giving statements of sundry facts taught in the esoteric schools—kept, so far, secret—by which the ancient symbolism of various nations is interpreted. It does not even give the *keys* to it, but merely opens a few of the hitherto secret drawers. No *new* philosophy is set up in the *Secret Doctrine*, only the hidden meaning of some of the religious allegories of antiquity is given, light being thrown on these by the esoteric sciences, and the common source is pointed out, whence all the world-religions and philosophies have sprung. Its chief attempt is to show, that however divergent the respective doctrines and systems of old may *seem* on their external or objective side, the agreement between all becomes perfect, so soon as the esoteric or *inner* side of these beliefs and their symbology are examined and a careful comparison made. It is also maintained that its doctrines and sciences, which form an integral cycle of universal cosmic facts and metaphysical axioms and truths, represent a complete and unbroken system; and that he who is brave and persevering enough, ready to crush the *animal* in himself, and forgetting the human *self*, sacrifices it to his Higher Ego, can always find his way to become initiated into these mysteries. This is all the *Secret Doctrine* claims. Are not a few facts and self-evident truths, found in these volumes—all the literary defects of the exposition notwithstanding, —truths *already proved practically to some*, better than the most ingenious "working" hypotheses, liable to be upset any day, than the *unexplainable* mysteries of religious dogmas, or the most seemingly profound philosophical speculations? Can the grandest among

these speculations be really profound, when from their *Alpha* to their *Omega* they are limited and conditioned by their author's *brain*-mind, hence dwarfed and crippled on that Procrustean bed, cut down to fit limited sensuous perceptions which will not allow the intellect to go beyond their enchanted circle? No "philosopher" who views the spiritual realm as a mere figment of superstition, and regards man's mental perceptions as simply the result of the organization of the brain, can ever be worthy of that name.

Nor has a materialist any right to the appellation, since it means a "lover of Wisdom", and Pythagoras, who was the first to coin the compound term, never limited Wisdom to this earth. One who affirms that the Universe and Man are objects of the senses only, and who fatally chains thought within the region of senseless matter, as do the Darwinian evolutionists, is at best a *sophiaphobe* when not a philosophaster—never a philosopher.

Therefore is it that in this age of Materialism, Agnosticism, Evolutionism, and false Idealism, there is not a system, however intellectually expounded, that can stand on its own legs, or fail to be criticized by an exponent from another school of thought as materialistic as itself; even Mr. Herbert Spencer, the greatest of all, is unable to answer some criticisms. Many are those who remember the fierce polemics that raged a few years ago in the English and American journals between the Evolutionists on the one hand and the Positivists on the other. The subject of the dispute was with regard to the attitude and relation that the theory of evolution would bear to religion. Mr. F. Harrison, the Apostle of Positivism, charged Mr. Herbert Spencer with restricting religion to the realm of reason, forgetting that feeling and not the cognizing faculty, played the most important part in it. The "erroneousness and insufficiency" of the ideas on the "Unknowable"—as developed in Mr. Spencer's works—were also taken to task by Mr. Harrison. The idea was *erroneous,* he held, because it was based on the acceptation of the metaphysical absolute. It was insufficient, he argued, because it brought deity down to an empty abstraction, void of any meaning.* To this the great English writer replied, that he had never thought of offering his "Unknowable" and Incognizable, as a subject for religious worship. Then stepped into the arena, the respective admirers and defenders of Messrs. Spencer and Harrison, some defending the *material metaphysics* of the former thinker (if we may be permitted to use this paradoxical yet correct definition of Mr. Herbert Spencer's philosophy), others, the arguments of the Godless and Christless Roman Catholicism of Auguste Comte,[1] both sides giving and receiving

---

* As the above is repeated from memory, it does not claim to be quoted with verbal exactitude, but only to give the gist of the argument.

[1] The epithet is Mr. Huxley's. In his lecture in Edinburgh in 1868, *On the Physical Basis of Life,* this great opponent remarked that Auguste "Comte's philosophy in practice might be compendiously described as *Catholicism minus Christianity,* and antagonistic to the very essence of Science."

very hard blows. Thus, Count d'Alviella of Brussels[2] suddenly discovered in Mr. H. Spencer a kind of hidden, yet *reverential* Theist, and compared Mr. Harrison to a casuist of mediæval Scholasticism.

It is not to discuss the relative merits of materialistic Evolutionism, or of Positivism either, that the two English thinkers are brought forward; but simply to point, as an illustration, to the Babel-like confusion of modern thought. While the Evolutionists (of Herbert Spencer's school) maintain that the historical evolution of the religious feeling consists in the constant abstraction of the attributes of Deity, and their final separation from the primitive concrete conceptions—this process rejoicing in the easy-going triple compound of *deanthropomorphization,* or the disappearance of human attributes—the Comtists on their side hold to another version. They affirm that fetishism, or the direct worship of nature, was the primitive religion of man, a too protracted-evolution alone having landed it in anthropomorphism. Their Deity is Humanity and the God they worship, Mankind, as far as we understand them. The only way, therefore, of settling the dispute, is to ascertain which of the two "philosophical" and "scientific" theories, is the less pernicious and the more probable. Is it true to say, as d'Alviella assures us, that Mr. Spencer's "Unknowable" contains all the elements necessary to religion; and, as that remarkable writer is alleged to imply, that "religious feeling tends to free itself from every moral element"; or, shall we accept the other extremity and agree with the Comtists, that gradually, religion will blend itself with, merge into, and disappear in *altruism* and its service to Humanity?

Useless to say that Theosophy, while rejecting the one-sidedness and therefore the *limitation* in both ideas, is alone able to reconcile the two, *i. e.,* the Evolutionists and the Positivists—on both metaphysical and practical lines. How to do this it is not here the place to say, as every Theosophist acquainted with the main tenets of the Esoteric Philosophy can do it for himself. We believe in an impersonal "Unknowable" and know well that the Absolute, or Absoluteness, can have nought to do with worship on anthropomorphic lines; Theosophy rejects the Spencerian "He" and substitutes the impersonal It for the personal pronoun, whenever speaking of the Absolute and the "Unknowable". And it teaches, as foremost of all virtues, *altruism* and self-sacrifice, brotherhood and compassion for every living creature, without, for all that, worshipping Man or Humanity. In the Positivist, moreover, who admits of no immortal soul in men, believes in no future life or reincarnation, such a "worship" becomes worse than fetishism: it is *Zoolatry*, the worship of the animals. For that alone which constitutes the *real* Man is, in the words of Carlyle, "the essence of our being, the mystery in us that calls itself 'I'— . . . a breath of Heaven;

[2] Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Brussels, in a philosophical *Essay on the religious meaning of the "Unknowable."*

the Highest Being reveals himself in man". This denied, man is but an animal—"the shame and scandal of the Universe", as Pascal puts it.

It is the old, old story, the struggle of matter and spirit, the "survival of the *unfittest,*" because of the strongest and most material. But the period when nascent Humanity, following the law of the natural and *dual* evolution, was descending along with spirit into matter—is closed. We (Humanity) are now helping matter to ascend toward spirit; and to do that we have to help substance to disenthral itself from the viscous grip of sense. We, of the fifth Root Race, are the direct descendants of the primeval Humanity of that Race; those, who on this side of the Flood tried, by commemorating it, to save the antediluvian Truth and Wisdom, and were worsted in our efforts by the dark genius of the Earth—the spirit of matter, whom the Gnostics called Ildabaoth and the Jews Jehovah. Think ye, that even the Bible of Moses, the book you know so well and understand so badly, has left this claim of the Ancient Doctrine without witness? It has not. Allow us to close with a (to you) familiar passage, only interpreted in its true light.

In the beginning of time, or rather, in the childhood of the fifth Race, "the whole earth was of one *lip* and of one speech", saith chapter XI of *Genesis.* Read esoterically, this means that mankind had one universal doctrine, a philosophy, common to all; and that men were *bound* by one religion, whether this term be derived from the Latin word *relegere,* "to gather, or be united" in speech or in thought, from *religens,* "revering the gods", or from *religare,* "to be bound fast together". Take it one way or the other, it means most undeniably and plainly that our forefathers from beyond the "flood" accepted in common one *truth—i. e.,* they believed in that aggregate of subjective and objective *facts* which form the consistent, logical and harmonious whole called by us the *Wisdom Religion.*

Now, reading the first nine verses of chapter XI between the lines, we get the following information. Wise in their generation, our early fathers were evidently acquainted with the imperishable truism which teaches that *in union alone lies strength*—in union of thought as well as in that of nations, of course. Therefore, lest in disunion they should be "scattered upon the face of the earth", and their Wisdom-religion should, in consequence, be broken up into a thousand fragments; and lest they, themselves, instead of towering as hitherto, *through knowledge,* heavenward, should, through *blind faith* begin gravitating earthward—the wise men, who "journeyed from the East", devised a plan. In those days temples were sites of learning, not of superstition; priests taught divine Wisdom, not man-invented dogmas, and the *ultima thule* of their religious activity did not centre in the contribution box, as at present. Thus—" 'Go to', they said, 'let us *build a city* and a *tower,* whose top may reach unto heaven, and let us make a name'. And they made *burnt brick* and used it for *stone,* and built therewith a *city* and a *tower.*"

So far, this is a very old story, known as well to a Sunday school ragamuffin as to Mr. Gladstone. Both believe very sincerely that these descendants of the "accursed Ham" were proud sinners whose object was like that of the Titans, to insult and dethrone Zeus-Jehovah, by reaching "heaven", the supposed abode of both. But since we find the story told in the *revealed*† Scripts, it must, like all the rest in them, have its esoteric interpretation. In this, Occult symbolism will help us. All the expressions that we have italicized, when read in the original Hebrew and according to the canons of esoteric symbolism, will yield quite a different construction. Thus:

1. "And the whole earth (mankind), was of *one lip* (*i. e.*, proclaimed the same teachings) and of the same *words*"—not of "speech" as in the authorized version.

Now the Kabalistic meaning of the term "words" and "word" may be found in the *Zohar* and also in the *Talmud*. "Words" *(Dabarim)* mean "powers", and *word*, in the singular, is a synonym of Wisdom, *e. g.*, "By the uttering of *ten words* was the world created"—*(Talmud* "Pirkey Aboth" c. 5., *Mish.* 1). Here the "words" refer to the ten Sephiroth, Builders of the Universe. Again: "By the *Word* (Wisdom Logos) of Yhvh were the Heavens made" *(ibid)*.

2-4. "And the man* (the chief leader) said to his neighbour, 'Go to, let us make *bricks* (disciples) *and burn them to a burning* (initiate, fill them with sacred fire), let us build us a *city* (establish mysteries and teach *the* Doctrine[1]) and a *tower (Ziggurrat*, a sacred temple tower) whose top may reach unto heaven'" (the highest limit reachable in space). The great tower of Nebo, of *Nabi* on the temple of Bel, was called "the house of the seven spheres *of heaven and earth*", and "the house of the stronghold (or strength, *tagimut)* and the foundation stone of heaven and earth".

Occult symbology teaches, that to *burn bricks for a city* means to train disciples for magic, a "hewn *stone*" signifying a *full* Initiate, *Petra* the Greek and *Kephas* the Aramaic word for stone, having the same meaning, *viz.*, "interpreter of the Mysteries", a

---

†A curious and rather unfortunate word to use, since, as a translation from the Latin *revelare*, it signifies diametrically the opposite of the now accepted meaning in English. For the word "to reveal" or "revealed" is derived from the Latin *revelare*, "to reveil" and not to *reveal, i. e.*, from *re* "again" or "back" and *velare* "to veil," or to hide something, from the word *velum* or "a vail" (or veil), a cover. Thus, instead of *un*vailing, or *revealing*, Moses has truly only "reveiled" once more the Egypto-Chaldean theological legends and allegories, into which, as one "learned in all the Wisdom of Egypt" he had been initiated. Yet Moses was not the first revealer or *reveiler*, as Ragon well observes. Thousands of years before him Hermes was credited with veiling over the Indian mysteries to adapt them for the land of the Pharaohs. Of course, at present there is no longer classical authority to satisfy the orthodox philologist, but the occult authority which maintains that originally the word *revelare* meant to "veil once more," and hence that revelation means the throwing a veil over a subject, a *blind*—is positively overwhelming.

* This is translated from the Hebrew original. "Chief-leader" (*Rab-Mag*) meaning literally Teacher-Magician, Master or *Guru*, as Daniel is shown to have been in Babylon.

[1] Some Homeric heroes also when they are said, like Laomedon, Priam's father, to have built cities, were in reality establishing the *Mysteries* and introducing the Wisdom-Religion in foreign lands.

Hierophant. The supreme initiation was referred to as "the burning with great burning". Thus, "the *bricks* are fallen, but we will *build* (anew) with hewn stones" of Isaiah becomes clear. For the true interpretation of the four last verses of the genetic allegory about the supposed "confusion of *tongues*" we may turn to the legendary version of the *Yezidis* and read verses 5, 6, 7, and 8 in *Genesis,* ch. xi, esoterically:—

"And *Adonai* (the Lord) came down and said: 'Behold, the people *is* one (the people are united in thought and deed) and they have *one lip* (doctrine)'. And now they begin to spread it and 'nothing will be restrained from them (they will have full magic powers and get all they want by such power, Kriyasakti,) *that they have imagined'.*"

And now what are the Yezidis and their version and what is Ad-onai? Ad is "the Lord", their ancestral god; and the Yezidis are a heretical Mussulman sect, scattered over Armenia, Syria, and especially Mosul, the very site of Babel (see "Chaldean Account of Genesis"), who are known under the strange name of "Devil-worshippers". Their confession of faith is very original. They recognise two powers or gods—Allah and Ad, (or Ad-onai) but identify the latter with Sheitan or Satan. This is but natural since Satan is also "a son of god"* (see Job I). As stated in the *Hibbert Lectures* (pp. 346 and 347), Satan the "Adversary", was the minister and *angel of God.* Hence, when questioned on the cause of their curious worship of one who has become the embodiment of Evil and the dark spirit of the Earth, they explain the reason in a most logical, if irreverent, manner. They tell you that Allah, being *All-good,* would not harm the smallest of his creatures. *Ergo,* has he no need of prayers, or burnt-offerings of the "firstlings of the flock and the fat thereof". But that their Ad, or the Devil, being *All-bad,* cruel, jealous, revengeful and proud, they have, in self-preservation, to propitiate him with sacrifices and burnt offerings smelling sweet in his nostrils, and to coax and flatter him. Ask any Sheik of the Yezidis of Mosul what they have to say, as to the confusion

---

* It is commanded in *Ecclesiasticus* XXI, 30, not to curse Satan, "lest one should forfeit his own life." Why? Because in their permutations "the Lord God," Moses, and Satan *are one.* The name the Jews gave while in Babylon to their *exoteric* God, the substitute for the *true* Deity of which they never spoke or wrote, was the Assyrian *Moshch* or *Adar,* the god of the scorching sun (the "Lord thy God *is* a consuming *flame*" verily!) and therefore, Mosheh or Moses, *shone* also. In Egypt, Typhon (Satan) the *red,* was identified both with the red Ass or Typhon called Set or Seth (and worshiped by the Hittites) and the same as *El* (the Sun god of the Assyrians and the Semites, or Jehovah), and with Moses, the red, also. (See *Isis Unv.* Vol. II. 523-24.) For Moses was red-skinned. According to the *Zohar* (Vol. I. p. 28) *B' sar d' Mosheh soomaq, i. e.,* "the flesh of Moses was *deep red,*" and the words refer to the saying) "The face of Moses was like the face of the Sun" (see *Qabbalah* by Isaac Myer p. 93). These three were *the three aspects* of the manifested God (the substitute for *Ain Suph* the infinite Deity) or Nature, in its three chief Kingdoms—the Fiery or Solar, the Human or Watery, the Animal or Earthy. There never was a *Mosheh* or Moses, before the Captivity and Ezra, the deep Kabalist; and what is now Moses had another name 2,000 years before. Where are the Hebrew scrolls before that time? Moreover, we find a corroboration of this in Dr. Sayce's *Hibbert Lectures* (1887). Adar is the Assyrian "War God" or the *Lord of Hosts* and the same as Moloch. The Assyrian equivalent of Mosheh (Moses) is *Masu,* the "double" or the "twin," and *Masu* is the title of Adar, meaning also a "hero." No one who reads carefully the said Lectures from page 40 to 58, can fail to see that Jehovah, Masu and Adar, with several others—are *permutations.*

of tongues, or speech when *Allah* "came down to see the city and the tower which the children of men had builded"; and they will tell you it is not Allah but *Ad,* the god Sheitan, who did it. The jealous genius of the earth became envious of the powers and sanctity of men (as the god Vishnu becomes jealous of the great powers of the *Yogis,* even when they were Daityas); and therefore this deity of matter and concupiscence confused their brains, tempted and made the "Builders" fall into his nets; and thus, having lost their purity, they lost therewith their knowledge and magic powers, intermarried and became "scattered upon the face of the earth".

This is more logical than to attribute to one's "God", the *All-good,* such ungodly tricks as are fathered upon him in the Bible. Moreover, the legend about the tower of Babel and the confusion *of speech,* is like much else, not original, but comes from the Chaldeans and Babylonians. George Smith found the version on a mutilated fragment of the Assyrian tablets, though there is nothing said in it about the confusion of *speech.* "I have translated the word 'speech' with a prejudice," he says *(Chaldean account of Genesis,* p. 163), "I have never seen the Assyrian word with this meaning". Anyone who reads for himself the fragmentary translation by G. Smith, on pages 160-163 in the volume cited, will find the version much nearer to that of the *Yezidis* than to the version of *Genesis.* It is he, whose "heart was evil" and who was "wicked", who confused "their counsel," not their "speech," and who broke "the Sanctuary . . . which carried Wisdom", and "bitterly they wept at Babel".

And so ought to "weep" all the philosophers and lovers of ancient Wisdom; for it is since then that the thousand and one exoteric substitutes for the one true Doctrine or *lip* had their beginning, obscuring more and more the intellects of men, and shedding innocent blood in fierce fanaticism. Had our modern philosophers studied, instead of sneering at, the old Books of Wisdom—say the *Kabala*—they would have found that which would have unveiled to them many a secret of ancient Church and State. As they have not, however, the result is evident. The dark cycle of *Kali Yug* has brought back *a Babel of modern thought,* compared with which the "confusion of tongues" itself appears a harmony. All is dark and uncertain; no argument in any department, neither in sciences, philosophy, law, nor even in religion. But, "woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness", saith Isaiah. The very elements seem confused and climates shift, as if the celestial "upper ten" themselves had lost their heads. All one can do is to sit still and look on, sad and resigned, while

> "The slack sail shifts from side to side;
> The boat untrimm'd admits the tide;
> Borne down adrift, at random toss'd
> The oar breaks short, . . . the rudder's lost."

MEANING OF "ALL EXPERIENCE"*

I should like to have explained what is meant by "all experience" in the Secret Doctrine, *new edition, page 45, where it is stated that it is necessary to pass through "all experience" in this manvantara before the Divine Spark can be individualized. Does this mean that one must in the human kingdom have experience of each phase of civilization? Must one be a plumber, carpenter, painter, minister, lawyer, physician, etc., before he can reach full consciousness? I am aware that all experience cannot be attained in any way but by repeated reëmbodiments, but the stumbling-block in my mind is what is meant by* all *experience. Further, is it necessary to go through the whole school of crime in order to develop strength to progress?*

W. Q. Judge.—First, experience, under evolution, in and through all nature's kingdom is a necessity for all egos because they constitute the spirit, spring and impulse of evolution; without them there would be no evolution. Hence all of that general experience is necessary because inevitable; and only by that great experience is individuality attainable. That is so because such is the law of our being.

Now, take any one of such progresses or kingdoms. It was full of variety. Such variations were inevitable and necessary. Curious shapes of animals were evolved in the evolutionary struggle, all necessary in such a struggle to make perfect. But they were only details in a grand whole, like steps on a journey. Does it trouble us, does the question about "all" arise here? If not, why should it arise about mere details of changing human life, not yet perfect, still struggling to attain, to alter, to polish? Plumbers, painters and carpenters are mechanics, as are those in many other more desirable occupations, but all are for mechanical experience due to our, or any, form of civilization. And the ego cannot get intuition of mechanics if it never is put through that sort of experience. "All experience," being thus found in a statement relative to great outlines and objects of evolution, must be considered thus and not as a mere detail. All possible experiences can be put under a few heads and it is those general types of experience we have to pass through. How would an ego know of motherhood and fatherhood if it never had the experience? Telling about them would not suffice. How would it know of governing if it had never governed, nor of submission if it had never been in bonds? There should be no stumbling-block in the word "all."

---

* This answer by Mr. Judge to the question asked was first printed in *The Theosophical Forum* of December, 1895. The title used is our own [Ed. Theosophy.]

THEOSOPHY OR JESUITISM*

> "Choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites." . . . —JOSHUA, xxiv., 15.

"The thirteenth number of *Le Lotus*, the recognised organ of Theosophy, among many articles of undeniable interest, contains one by Madame Blavatsky in reply to the Abbé Roca. The eminent writer, who is certainly the most learned woman of our acquaintance,[1] discusses the following question: *'Has Jesus ever existed?'*[2] She destroys the Christian legend, in its details, at least, with irrecusable texts which are not usually consulted by religious historians.

"This article is producing a profound sensation in the Catholic and Judeo-Catholic swamp: we are not surprised at this, for the author's arguments are such as it is difficult to break down, even were one accustomed to the Byzantine disputes of theology."

—PARIS, Evening paper, of May 12th, 1888.

THE series of articles, one of which is referred to in the above quotation from a well-known French evening paper, was originally called forth by an article in *Le Lotus* by the Abbé Roca, a translation of which was published in the January number of LUCIFER.

These articles, it would seem, have stirred up many slumbering animosities. They appear, in particular, to have touched the Jesuit party in France somewhat nearly. Several correspondents have written calling attention to the danger incurred by Theosophists in raising up against themselves such virulent and powerful foes. Some of our friends would have us keep silent on these topics. Such is not, however, the policy of LUCIFER, nor ever will be. Therefore, the present opportunity is taken to state, once for all, the views which Theosophists and Occultists entertain with regard to the Society of Jesus. At the same time, all those who are pursuing in life's great wilderness of vain evanescent pleasures and empty conventionalities *an ideal worth living for,* are offered the choice between the two now once more rising powers—the Alpha and the Omega at the two opposite ends of the realm of giddy, idle existence.—THEOSOPHY and JESUITISM.

---

*This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for June, 1888.

[1]The humble individual of that name renders thanks to the editor of PARIS: not so much for the flattering opinion expressed as for the rare surprise to find the name of "Blavatsky," for once, neither preceded nor followed by any of the usual abusive epithets and adjectives which the highly-cultured English and American newspapers and their gentlemanly editors are so fond of coupling with the said cognomen.—[ED.]

[2] The question is rather: Did the "historical" Jesus ever exist?—[ED.]

For, in the field of religious and intellectual pursuits, these two are the only luminaries—a *good* and an *evil* star, truly—glimmering once more from behind the mists of the Past, and ascending on the horizon of mental activities. They are the only two powers capable in the present day of extricating one thirsty for intellectual life from the clammy slush of the stagnant pool known as Modern Society, so crystallized in its cant, so dreary and monotonous in its squirrel-like motion around the wheel of fashion. Theosophy and Jesuitism are the two opposite poles, one far above, the other far below even that stagnant marsh. Both offer power—one to the spiritual, the other to the psychic and intellectual Ego in man. The former is "the wisdom that is from *above* . . . pure, peaceable, gentle . . . full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy," while the latter is "the wisdom that *descendeth not from above,* but is earthly, sensual, DEVILISH."* One is the power of Light, the other that of Darkness. . . .

A question will surely be asked: "Why should anyone choose between the two? Cannot one remain in the world, a good Christian of whatever church, without gravitating to either of these poles?" Most undeniably, one can do so, for a few more years to come. But the cycle is rapidly approaching the last limit of its turning point. One out of the three great churches of Christendom is split into atomic sects, whose number increases yearly; and a house divided against itself, as is the Protestant Church—MUST FALL. The third, the Roman Catholic, the only one that has hitherto succeeded in appearing to retain all its integrity, is rapidly decaying from within. It is honeycombed throughout, and is being devoured by the ravenous microbes begotten by Loyola.

It is no better now than a Dead Sea fruit, fair for some to look at, but full of the rottenness of decay and death within. Roman Catholicism is but a name. As a Church it is a phantom of the Past and a mask. It is absolutely and indissolubly bound up with, and fettered by the Society of Ignatius Loyola; for, as rightly expressed by Lord Robert Montagu, "The Roman Catholic Church is (now) the largest Secret Society in the world, beside which Freemasonry is but a pigmy." Protestantism is slowly, insidiously, but as surely, infected with Latinism—the new ritualistic sects of the High Church, and such men among its clergy as Father Rivington, being undeniable evidence of it. In fifty years more at the present rate of success of Latinism among the "upper ten," the English aristocracy will have returned to the faith of King Charles II., and its servile coypist—mixed Society—will have followed suit. And then the Jesuits will begin to reign alone and supreme over the Christian portions of the globe, for they have crept even in to the Greek Church.

---

*James' General Epistle, chapter iii., 15, 17.

It is vain to argue and claim a difference between Jesuitism and Roman Catholicism proper, for the latter is now sucked into and inseparably amalgamated with the former. We have public assurance for it in the pastoral of 1876 by the Bishop of Cambrai. "*Clericalism, Ultramontanism and Jesuitism are one and the same thing—that is to say, Roman Catholicism*—and the distinctions between them have been created by the enemies of religion," says the "Pastoral." "There was a time," adds Monseigneur the Cardinal, "when a certain theological opinion was commonly professed in France concerning the authority of the Pope. . . . It was restricted to our nation, and was of recent origin. The civil power during a century and a half imposed official instruction. Those who professed these opinions were called Gallicans, and those who protested were called Ultramontanes, because they had their doctrinal centre beyond the Alps, at Rome. To-day *the distinction between the two schools is no longer admissible.* Theological Gallicanism can no longer exist, since this opinion has ceased to be tolerated by the Church. *It has been solemnly condemned, past all return, by the Œcumenical Council of the Vatican.* One cannot now be a Catholic without being Ultramontane —and Jesuit."

A plain statement; and as cool as it is plain.

The pastoral made a certain noise in France and in the Catholic world, but was soon forgotten. And as two centuries have rolled away since *an exposé* of the infamous principles of the Jesuits was made (of which we will speak presently), the "Black Militia" of Loyola has had ample time to lie so successfully in denying the just charges, that even now, when the present Pope has brilliantly sanctioned the utterance of the Bishop of Cambrai, the Roman Catholics will hardly confess to such a thing. Strange exhibition of *infallibility* in the Popes! The "infallible" Pope, Clement XIV (Ganganelli), suppressed the Jesuits on the 23rd of July, 1773, and yet they came to life again; the "infallible" Pope, Pius VII., re-established them on the 7th of August, 1814. The infallible Pope, Pius IX., travelled, during the whole of his long Pontificate, between the Scylla and Charybdis of the Jesuit question; his infallibility helping him very little. And now the "infallible" Leo XIII. (fatal figures!) raises the Jesuits again to the highest pinnacle of their sinister and graceless glory.

The recent *Brevet* of the Pope (hardly two years old) dated July 13th (the same fatal figure), 1886, is an event, the importance of which can never be overvalued. It begins with the words *Dolemus inter alia*, and reinstalls the Jesuits in all the rights of the Order that had ever been cancelled. It was a *manifesto* and a loud defiant insult to all the Christian nations of the New and the Old worlds. From an article by Louis Lambert in the *Gaulois* (August 18th, 1886) we learn that "In 1750 there were 40,000 Jesuits all over the world. In 1800, *officially* they were reckoned at about

1,000 men, only. In 1886, they numbered between 7 and 8,000." This last modest number can well be doubted. For, verily now—"Where you meet a man believing in the salutary nature of falsehoods, or the divine authority of things doubtful, and fancying that to serve the good cause he must call the devil to his aid, there is a follower of Unsaint Ignatius," says Carlyle, and adds of that black militia of Ignatius that: "They have given a new substantive to modern languages. The word Jesuitism now, in all countries, expresses an idea for which there was in nature no prototype before. Not till these last centuries had the human soul generated that abomination, or needed to name it. Truly they have achieved great things in the world, and a general result that we may call stupendous."

And now since their reinstallment in Germany and elsewhere, they will achieve still grander and more stupendous results. For the future can be best read by the past. Unfortunately in this year of the Pope's jubilee the civilized portions of humanity—even the Protestant ones—seem to have entirely forgotten that past. Let then those who profess to despise Theosophy, the fair child of early Aryan thought and Alexandrian Neo-Platonism, bow before the monstrous Fiend of the Age, but let them not forget at the same time its history.

It is curious to observe, how persistently the Order has assailed everything like Occultism from the earliest times, and Theosophy since the foundation of its last Society, which is ours. The Moors and the Jews of Spain felt the weight of the oppressive hand of Obscurantism no less than did the Kabalists and Alchemists of the Middle Ages. One would think Esoteric philosophy and especially the Occult Arts, or Magic, were an abomination to these good holy fathers? And so indeed they would have the world believe. But when one studies history and the works of their own authors published with the *imprimatur* of the Order, what does one find? That the *Jesuits have practised not only Occultism, but* BLACK MAGIC *in its worst form,* more than any other body of men; and that to it they owe in large measure their power and influence!*

To refresh the memory of our readers and *all those whom it may concern,* a short summary of the doings and actings of our good friends, may be once more attempted. For those who are inclined to laugh, and deny the subterranean and truly infernal means used by "Ignatius' black militia," we may state facts.

In "Isis Unveiled" it was said of this *holy* Fraternity that—

"though established only in 1535 to 1540—in 1555 there was already a general outcry raised against them." And now once more—

"that crafty, learned, conscienceless, terrible soul of Jesuitism, within the body of Romanism, is slowly but surely possessing itself of the whole prestige and spiritual power that clings to it. . . . Throughout antiquity,

*Mesmerism or HYPNOTISM is a prominent factor in Occultism. It is *magic*. The Jesuits were acquainted with and practised it ages before Mesmer and Charcot.—[ED.]

where, in what land, can we find anything like this Order or anything even approaching it? . . . The cry of an outraged public morality was raised against it from its very birth. Barely fifteen years had elapsed after the bull approving its constitution was promulgated, when its members began to be driven away from one place to the other. Portugal and the Low Countries got rid of them, in 1578; France in 1594; Venice in 1606; Naples in 1622. From St. Petersburg they were expelled in 1815, and from all Russia in 1820."

The writer begs to remark to the readers, that this, which was written in 1875, applies admirably and with still more force in 1888. Also that the statements that follow in quotation marks may be all verified. And thirdly, that the principles *(principii)* of the Jesuits that are now brought forward, are extracted from authenticated MSS. or folios printed by various members themselves of this very distinguished body. Therefore, they can be checked and verified in the "British Museum" and Bodleian Library with still more ease than in our works.

Many are copied from the large Quarto† published by the authority of, and verified and collated by, the Commissioners of the French Parliament. The statements therein were collected and presented to the King, in order that, as the "Arrêt du Parlement du 5 Mars, 1762," expresses it, "the elder son of the Church might be made aware of the perversity of this doctrine. . . . A doctrine authorizing Theft, Lying, Perjury, Impurity, every Passion and Crime; teaching Homicide, Parricide, and Regicide, overthrowing religion in order to substitute for it superstition, by favouring *Sorcery,* Blasphemy, Irreligion, and Idolatry . . . etc." Let us then examine the ideas on *magic* of the Jesuits, that magic which they are pleased to call *devilish* and *Satanic* when studied by the Theosophists. Writing on this subject in his secret instructions, Anthony Escobar* says:

"It is lawful . . . to make use of the Science acquired through the assistance of the Devil, provided the preservation and use of that Knowledge do not depend upon the Devil, for the Knowledge is good in itself, and the sin by which it was acquired has gone by."[1]

True: why should not a Jesuit cheat the Devil as well as he cheats every layman?

"Astrologers and soothsayers are either bound, or are not bound, to restore the reward of their divination, if the event does not come to pass. I own," remarks the *good* Father Escobar, "that the former opinion does not at all please me, because, when the astrologer or diviner has exerted all the diligence *in the diabolical art* which is essential to his purpose, he has fulfilled his duty, whatever may be the result. As the physician . . . is not bound to restore his fee . . . if his patient should die; so neither is the astrologer bound to restore his charge . . . except where he has used no effort, or was ignorant of his diabolic art; because, when he has used his endeavours he has not deceived."[2]

† Extracts from this "Arret" were compiled into a work in 4 vols., 12mo., which appeared at Paris, in 1762, and was known as "Extraits des Assertions, etc." In a work entitled "Réponse aux Assertions," an attempt was made by the Jesuits to throw discredit upon the facts collected by the Commissioners of the French Parliament in 1762, as for the most part malicious fabrications. "To ascertain the validity of this impeachment," says the author of "The Principles of the Jesuits," "the libraries of the two Universities, of the British Museum and of Sion College have been searched for the authors cited; and in every instance where the volume was found, the correctness of the citation was established."

*"Theologiæ Moralis," Tomus iv. Lugduni, 1663.

[1] Tom. iv., lib. xxviii., sect. I, de Præcept I., c. 20, n. 184.

[2] Ibid., sect. 2, de Præcept I., Probl. 113, n. 586.

Busembaum and Lacroix, in "Theologia Moralis,"[3] say,

"PALMISTRY MAY BE CONSIDERED LAWFUL, IF FROM THE LINES AND DIVISIONS OF THE HANDS IT CAN ASCERTAIN THE DISPOSITION OF THE BODY, AND CONJECTURE, WITH PROBABILITY, THE PROPENSITIES AND AFFECTIONS OF THE SOUL."[4]

This noble fraternity, which many preachers have of late so vehemently denied to have ever been a *secret* one, has been sufficiently proved to be such. Its constitutions were translated into Latin by the Jesuit Polancus, and printed in the college of the Society at Rome, in 1558. "They were jealously kept secret, the greater part of the Jesuits themselves knowing only extracts from them.[5] *They were never produced to light until* 1761, *when they were published by order of the French Parliament* in 1761, 1762, in the famous process of Father Lavalette." The Jesuits reckon it among the greatest achievements of their Order that Loyola supported, by a special memorial to the Pope, a petition for the reorganization of that abominable and abhorred instrument of wholesale butchery—the infamous tribunal of the Inquisition.

This Order of Jesuits is now all-powerful in Rome. They have been reinstalled in the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, in the Department of the Secretary of the State, and in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Pontifical Government was for years previous to Victor Emanuel's occupation of Rome entirely in their hands. . . . —*Isis,* vol. II, p. 355, et seq. 1876.

What was the origin of that order? It may be stated in a few words. In the year 1534, on August 16th, an ex-officer and "Knight of the Virgin," from the Biscayan Provinces, and the proprietor of the magnificent castle of *Casa Solar*—Ignatius Loyola,* became the hero of the following incident. In the subterranean chapel of the Church of Montmartre, surrounded by a few priests and students of theology, he received their pledges to devote their whole lives to the spreading of Roman Catholicism by every and all means, whether good or foul; and he was thus enabled to establish a new Order. Loyola proposed to his six chief companions that their Order should be a *militant* one, in order to fight for the interests of the *Holy* seat of Roman Catholicism. Two means were adopted to make the object answer; the education of youth, and proselytism (*apostolate*). This was during the reign of Pope Paul III., who gave his full sympathy to the new scheme. Hence in 1540 was published the famous papal bull—*Regimini militantis Ecclesiæ* (the regiment of the warring, or *militant* Church)—after which the Order began increasing rapidly in numbers and power.

---

[3] "Theologia Moralis nunc pluribus partibus aucta, à R.P. Claudio Lacroix, Societatis Jesu." Coloniæ, 1757 (Ed. Mus. Brit.)

[4] Tom., ii., lib. iii., Pars. I, Fr. I, c. I, dub. 2, resol. viii. What a pity that the counsel for the defence had not bethought them to cite this orthodox legalization of "cheating by palmistry or otherwise," at the recent religio-scientific prosecution of the medium Slade, in London.

[5] Niccolini: "History of the Jesuits."

*Or "*St. Inigo* the Biscayan," by his true name.

At the death of Loyola, the society counted more than one thousand Jesuits, though admission into the ranks was, as alleged, surrounded with extraordinary difficulties. It was another celebrated and unprecedented bull, issued by Pope Julius the III. in 1552, that brought the Order of Jesus to such eminence and helped it towards such rapid increase; for it placed the society outside and *beyond* the jurisdiction of local ecclesiastical authority, granted the Order its own laws, and permitted it to recognise but one supreme authority—that of its General, whose residence was then at Rome. The results of such an arrangement proved fatal to the Secular Church. High prelates and Cardinals had very often to tremble before a simple subordinate of the Society of Jesus. Its generals always got the upper hand in Rome, and enjoyed the unlimited confidence of the Popes, who thus frequently became tools in the hands of the Order. Naturally enough, in those days when political power was one of the rights of the "Vice-gerants of God"—the strength of the crafty society became simply tremendous. In the name of the Popes, the Jesuits thus granted to themselves unheard-of privileges, which they enjoyed unstintedly up to the year 1772. In that year, Pope Clement XIV. published a new bull, *Dominus ac Redemptor* (the Lord and Redeemer), abolishing the famous Order. But the Popes proved helpless before this new Frankenstein, the fiend that one of the "Vicars of God" had evoked. The society continued its existence secretly, notwithstanding the persecutions of both Popes and the lay authorities of every country. In 1801, under the new *alias* of the "Congregation of the *Sacré Cœur de Jésus,*" it had already penetrated into and was tolerated in Russia and Sicily.

In 1814, as already said, a new bull of Pius VII. resurrected the Order of Jesus, though its late privileges, even those among the lay clergy, were withheld from it. The lay authorities, in France as elsewhere, have found themselves compelled ever since to tolerate and to count with the Jesuits. All that they could do was to deny them any special privileges and subject the members of that society to the laws of the country, equally with other ecclesiastics. But, gradually and imperceptibly the Jesuits succeeded in obtaining special favours even from the lay authorities. Napoleon III. granted them permission to open seven colleges in Paris only, for the education of the young, the only condition exacted being, that these colleges should be under the authority and supervision of local bishops. But the establishments had hardly been opened when the Jesuits broke that rule. The episode with the Archbishop Darboy is well known. Desiring to visit the Jesuit college in the *Rue de la Poste* (Paris), he was refused admittance, and the gates were closed against him by order of the Superior. The Bishop lodged a complaint at the Vatican. But the answer was delayed for such a length of time, that the Jesuits remained

virtually masters of the situation and *outside* of every jurisdiction but their own.

And now read what Lord R. Montagu says of their deeds in Protestant England, and judge:

"The Jesuit Society—with its Nihilist adherents in Russia, its Socialist allies in Germany, its Fenians and Nationalists in Ireland, its accomplices and slaves in its power, think of that Society which has not scrupled to stir up the most bloody wars between nations, in order to advance its purposes; and yet can stoop to hunting down a single man because he knows their secret and will not be its slave . . . think of a Society which can devise such a diabolical scheme and then boast of it; and say whether a desperate energy is not required in us? . . . If you have been behind the scenes . . . then you would still have before you the labour of unravelling all that is being done by our Government and of tearing off the tissue of lies by which their acts are concealed. Repeated attempts will have taught you that there is not a public man on whom you can lean. Because as England is 'between the upper and nether millstone,' none but adherents or slaves are now advanced; and it stands to reason that the Jesuits, who have got that far, have prepared new millstones for the time when the present ones shall have passed away; and then again, younger millstones to come on after, and wield the power of the nation."—("Recent Events and a Clue to their Solution,' page 76.)

In France the affairs of the sons of Loyola flourished to the day when the ministry of Jules Ferry compelled them to retire from the field of battle. Many are those who still remember the useless strictness of the police measures, and the clever enacting of dramatic scenes by the Jesuits themselves. This only added to their popularity with certain classes. They obtained thereby an aureole of martyrdom, and the sympathy of every pious and foolish woman in the land was secured to them.

And now that Pope Leo XIII. has once more restored to the good fathers, the Jesuits, all the privileges and rights that had ever been granted to their predecessors, what can the public at large of Europe and America expect? Judging by the *bull,* the complete mastery, moral and physical, over every land where there are Roman Catholics, is secured to the Black Militia. For in this bull the Pope confesses that of all the religious congregations now existing, *that of the Jesuits is the one dearest to his heart.* He lacks words sufficiently expressive to show the ardent love he (Pope Leo) feels for them, etc., etc. Thus they have the certitude of the support of the Vatican in all and everything. And as it is they who guide him, we see his Holiness coquetting and flirting with every great European potentate—from Bismarck down to the crowned heads of Continent and Isle. In view of the ever increasing influence of Leo XIII., moral and political—such a certitude for the Jesuits is of no mean importance.

For more minute particulars the reader is referred to such well-known authors as Lord Robert Montagu in England; and on the Continent, Edgard Quinet: *l'Ultramontanisme;* Michelet: *Le prêtre, la Femme et la Famille;* Paul Bert: *Les Jésuites;* Friedrich

Nippold: *Handbuch der Neurster Kirchengeschichte* and *Welche Wege führen nach Rome?* etc., etc.

Meanwhile, let us remember the words of warning we received from one of our late Theosophists, Dr. Kenneth Mackenzie, who, speaking of the Jesuits, says that:—

"Their spies are everywhere, of all apparent ranks of society, and they may appear learned and wise, or simple or foolish, as their instructions run. There are Jesuits of both sexes, and all ages, and it is a well-known fact that members of the Order, of high family and delicate nurture, are acting as menial servants in Protestant families, and doing other things of a similar nature in aid of the Society's purposes. We cannot be too much on our guard, for the whole Society, being founded on a law of unhesitating obedience, can bring its force to bear on any given point with unerring and fatal accuracy."*

The Jesuits maintain that "the Society of Jesus is not of human invention, *but it proceeded from him whose name it bears.* For Jesus himself described that rule of life which the Society follows, *first by his example,* and afterwards by his words."[1]

Let, then, all pious Christians listen and acquaint themselves with this alleged "rule of life" and precepts of their God, as exemplified by the Jesuits. Peter Alagona (*St. Thomae Aquinatis Summae Theologiae Compendium*) says: "By the command of God it is lawful to kill an innocent person, to steal, or commit . . . (*Ex mandato Dei licet occidere innocentem, furari, fornicari*); because he is the Lord of life and death, and all things, *and it is due to him thus to fulfil his command*" (Ex primâ secundæ, Quæst., 94).

"A man of a religious order, who for a short time lays aside his habit *for a sinful purpose,* is free from heinous sin, and does not incur the penalty of excommunication." (Lib. iii., sec. 2, Probl. 44, n. 212).[2] (*Isis Unveiled,* vol. II.)

John Baptist Taberna (*Synopsis Theologiæ Practicæ*) propounds the following question: "Is a judge bound to restore the bribe which he has received for passing sentence?" *Answer: "If he has received the bribe for passing an unjust sentence, it is probable that he may keep it. . . . This opinion is maintained and defended by fifty-eight doctors"* (Jesuits).[3]

We must abstain at present from proceeding further. So disgustingly licentious, hypocritical, and demoralizing are nearly all of these precepts, that it was found impossible to put many of them in print, except in the Latin language.[4]

But what are we to think of the future of Society if it is to be controlled in word and deed by this villainous Body! What are we to expect from a public, which, knowing the existence of the above mentioned charges, and that they are not exaggerated *but pertain to historical fact,* still tolerates, when it does not rever-

---

*"Royal Masonic Cyclopædia," p. 369.

[1] Imago: "Primi Sæculi Societatis Jesu," lib. I., c. 3, p. 64.

[2] Anthony Escobar: "Universæ Theologiæ Moralis receptiore, absque lite sententiæ," etc., Tomus i., Lugduni, 1652 (Ed. Bibl. Acad. Cant.). "Idem sentio, e breve illud tempus ad unius horæ spatium traho. Religiosus itaque habitum demittens assignato hoc temporis interstitio, non incurrit excommunicationem, *etiamsi dimittat non solum ex causa turpi, scilicet fornicandi, aut clam aliquid abripiendi, set etiam ut incognitus ineat lupanar.*" Probl. 44, n. 213.

[3] Pars. II., Tra. 2, c. 31.

[4] See "Principles of the Jesuits developed in a Collection of Extracts from their own authors." London, 1839.

ence, the Jesuits on meeting them, while it is ever ready to point the finger of contempt at Theosophists and Occultists. Theosophy is persecuted with unmerited slander and ridicule at the instigation of these same Jesuits, and many are those who hardly dare to confess their belief in the philosophy of Arhatship. Yet no Theosophical Society has ever threatened the public with moral decay and the full and free exercise of the seven capital sins under the mask of holiness and the guidance of Jesus! Nor are their rules *secret,* but open to all, for they live in the broad daylight of truth and sincerity. And how about the Jesuits in this respect?

"Jesuits who belong to the highest category," says again Louis Lambert, "have full and absolute liberty of action—even to murder and arson. On the other hand, those Jesuits who are found guilty of the slightest attempt to endanger or compromise the Society of Jesus—*are punished mercilessly.* They are allowed to write the most heretical books, provided they do not *expose* the secrets of the Order."

And these "secrets" are undeniably of a most terrible and dangerous nature. Compare a few of these *Christian precepts* and rules for entering this Society of "*divine* origin," as claimed for it, with the laws that regulated admissions to the secret societies (temple mysteries) of the Pagans.

"A brother Jesuit *has the right to kill anyone that may prove dangerous to Jesuitism.*"

"Christian and Catholic sons," says Stephen Fagundez, "may accuse their fathers of the crime of heresy if they wish to turn them from the faith, although they may know that their parents will be burned with fire, and put to death for it, as Tolet teaches. . . . And not only may they refuse them food, . . . *but they may also justly kill them.*"[2]

It is well known that Nero, the Emperor, *had never dared* seek initiation into the pagan Mysteries on account of the murder of Agrippina!

Under Section XIV. of the *Principles of the Jesuits,* we find on *Homicide* the following *Christian* ethics inculcated by Father Henry Henriquez, in *Summae Theologiae Moralis,* Tomus I., Venetiis, 1600 (Ed. Coll. Sion): "If an adulterer, even though he should be an ecclesiastic . . . being attacked by the husband, kills his aggressor . . . *he is not considered irregular: non ridetur irregularis* (Lib. XIV., *de Irregularite,* c. 10, §3).

"If a father were obnoxious to the State (being in banishment), and to the society at large, and there were no other means of averting such an injury, then I should approve of this" (for a son to kill his father), says Sec. XV., *on Parricide and Homicide.**

"It will be lawful for an ecclesiastic, or one of the religious order, *to kill a calumniator* who threatens to spread atrocious accusations against himself or his religion,"[1] is the rule set forth by the Jesuit Francis Amicus.

One of the most unconquerable obstacles to initiation, with the Egyptians as with the Greeks, was any degree of murder, or even of simple unchastity.

It is these "enemies of the Human Race," as they are called, that have once more obtained their old privileges of working in

---

[2] In "Præcepta Decaloga" (Edit. of Sion Library), Tom. i., lib. iv., c. 2, n. 7, 8.
*Opinion of John Dicastille, Sect. XV., "De Justitia et Jure," etc., cens. pp. 319, 320.
[1] Cursus Theologici, "Tomus V., Duaci, 1642, Disp. 36, Sect. 5, n. 118.

the dark, and inveigling and destroying every obstacle they find in their way—with absolute impunity. But—"forewarned, forearmed." Students of Occultism should know that, while the Jesuits have, by their devices, contrived to make the world in general, and Englishmen in particular, think there is no such thing as Magic, these astute and wily schemers themselves hold magnetic circles, and form magnetic chains by the concentration of their collective will, when they have any special object to effect, or any particular and important person to influence. Again, they use their riches lavishly to help them in any project. Their wealth is enormous. When recently expelled from France, they brought so much money with them, some part of which they converted into English Funds, that immediately the latter were raised to par, which the *Daily Telegraph* pointed out at the time.

They have succeeded. The Church is henceforth an inert tool, and the Pope a poor weak instrument in the hands of this Order. But for how long? The day may come when their wealth will be violently taken from them, and they themselves mercilessly destroyed amidst the general execrations and applause of all nations and peoples. There is a Nemesis—Karma, though often it allows Evil and Sin to go on successfully for ages. It is also a vain attempt on their part to threaten the Theosophists—their implacable enemies. For the latter are, perhaps, *the only body* in the whole world who need not fear them. They may try, and perhaps succeed, in crushing individual members. They would vainly try their hand, strong and powerful as it may be, in an attack on the Society. Theosophists are as well protected, and better, than themselves. To the man of modern science, to all those who know nothing, and who do not believe what they hear of White and Black magic, the above will read like nonsense. Let it be, though Europe will very soon experience, and it is already so experiencing, the heavy hand of the latter.

Theosophists are slandered and reviled by the Jesuits and their adherents everywhere. They are charged with idolatry and superstition; and yet we read in the same "Principles" of the Father Jesuits:—

"The more true opinion is, *that all inanimate and irrational things may be legitimately worshipped,*" says Father Gabriel Vasquez, treating of Idolatry. "If the doctrine which we have established be rightly understood, not only may a painted image and every holy thing, set forth by public authority, be properly adored with God as the image of Himself, but also any other thing of this world, whether it be inanimate and irrational, or in its nature rational."*

This is Roman Catholicism, identical and *henceforth one* with Jesuitism—as shown by the pastoral of the Cardinal Bishop of Cambrai, and Pope Leo. A precept this, which, whether or not doing honour to the Christian Church, may at least be profitably

*"De Cultu Adorationis, Libri Tres," Lib. iii., Disp. i., c. 2.

quoted by any Hindu, Japanese, or any other "heathen" Theosophist, who has not yet given up the belief of his childhood.

But we must close. There is a prophecy in the heathen East about the Christian West, which, when rendered into comprehensible English, reads thus: "When the conquerors of all the ancient nations are in their turn conquered *by an army of black dragons begotten by their sins and born of decay,* then the hour of liberation for the former will strike." Easy to see who are the "black dragons." And these will in their turn see their power arrested and forcibly put to an end by the liberated legions. Then, perhaps, there will be a new invasion of an Atilla from the far East. One day the millions of China and Mongolia, heathen and Mussulman, furnished with every murderous weapon invented by civilization, and forced upon the *Celestial* of the East, by the *infernal* spirit of trade and love of lucre of the West, drilled, moreover, to perfection by Christian man-slayers—will pour into and invade decaying Europe like an irrepressible torrent. This will be the result of the work of the Jesuits, who will be its first victims, let us hope.

ABOUT PATRIOTISM*

Believing in reïncarnation as many Theosophists do, and considering the fact that our ten preceding births may have been in ten different nations or races, how can the sentiment of patriotism be defended?

W. Q. Judge.—Patriotism is love for the land in which your body was born, and it would seem on reflection that whether ten preceding births were in other nations and races or not has nothing to do with the patriotism felt in this. In each birth the same feeling would be felt for each country. All this has no connection with a defence of patriotism. Inasmuch as the sentiment has been always recognized as noble and good its defence seems unnecessary. Why should Theosophists, I may ask, raise a question of doubt as to such a high sentiment as this? It needs no defence at all. At first the man may love only himself; then he enlarges his love and extends it to his family; then a little more and he takes in his town or county; until at last he still further enlarges his love so as to embrace his country. Patriotism then is a love that is larger than the personal and hence a nearer approach to that feeling which would make all men brothers. A person cannot die for his country unless his love has gone beyond the confines of his family. Patriotism is in fact the best example humanity can furnish of an attempt at the universality of love that belongs to the Self within.

---

* This answer by Mr. Judge to the question asked was first printed in *The Theosophical Forum* of August, 1895. The title used is our own [Ed. Theosophy.]

Lucifer 2 83

FROM THE NOTE BOOK OF AN UNPOPULAR PHILOSOPHER*

SCIENTIFIC NOTES.

De Profundis!

THE world of science has just sustained a heavy loss, an irreparable one, it is feared. The blow falls especially heavy on two men of science. For the great calamity which deprives at once humanity of a new and lovely, albeit gelatinous forefather, and the German Darwin of the very topmost leaf from his crown of scientific laurels, strikes simultaneously Messrs. Haeckel and Huxley. One, as all the world—except ignoramuses, of course—knows, was the fond parent of the late lamented *Bathybius Haeckelii*—just passed away—or shall we say *transfigured?*—the other, the godfather of that tender sea-flower, the jelly-speck of the oceans. . . . [1]

"Woe is me, for I am undone!" cried Isaiah, upon seeing the "Lord of Hosts" appear as smoke. "Woe are we!" exclaim both Messrs. Huxley and Haeckel upon finding their occult progeny—the *Moneron*—Bathybius that was—turning under pitiless chemical analysis into a vulgar pinch of *precipitate of sulphate of lime!* And, as with a great cry, they fall into each other's arms:

"They weep each other's woe. . . .

. . . . . .

O woeful day! O day of woe! . . . "

repeat, Greek-chorus-like, all the learned bodies of the two continents, of the Old and of the New World.

Alas, alas, young Bathybius exists no more! . . . Nay, worse, for it is now being ascertained that he has never had any existence at all—except, perhaps, in the too credulous scientific brains of a few naturalists.

Requiescat in pace, sweet, dream-like myth, whose gelatinous appearance befooled even two great Darwinists and led them right into the meshes of crafty *Maya!* But—*"De mortuis nil nisi bonum"*—we know, we know. Still it is not saying evil of the poor ex-Bathybius, I hope, to remember he is now but a pinch of lime. *Horrible dictu:* in whom shall, or can we, place henceforth our trust? Whither shall we turn for a primordial ancestor, now that even that jelly-like stranger has been taken away from us? Verily, we are stranded; and humanity, an orphan once more, is again as it was before—a parish-babe in Kosmos, without father, mother, or even a second-hand god in the shape of a Bathybius as a foundation-stone to stand upon! Woe! Woe!

But there may be still some balm left in Gilead. If our ever to be lamented ancestor, breaking under a too severe analysis, has

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for March, 1888.

[1] *Vide* first number of LUCIFER, page 73, "Literary Jottings."

ceased to be a protoplasmic entity, it is still a salt. And are we not assured that we "are the salt of the earth?" Besides which we are salt-generating animals anyhow, and therefore may still hope to be related with the late Bathybius. Decidedly, mankind has little to lament for. Haeckel and Mr. Huxley are thus the chief and only sufferers.

No wonder, then, that the Royal Society is said to go into deep mourning for a whole lunar month. Moreover, the "F.R.S.'s" should not fail to send Dr. Aveling to Berlin to carry the expression of their deep collective sympathy to poor Dr. Haeckel for the bereavement they have caused to him. For, *firstly*—who fitter than the eminent translator of the "Pedigree of Man" to offer consolation to the eminent German naturalist, the author of *Anthropogenesis* and other inspired volumes? And *secondly*—it is a case of "Science *versus* Science." It is the right hand of Science which has robbed her left hand of her promising progeny—the *Bathybius Haeckelii.* We have but one more instance like this one in history —namely, the sad case of Count Ugolino. Walled-in, in the famous tower, in company with his family to starve, the generous and self-sacrificing nobleman fearing to leave his children orphans—devoured them one after the other—"lest they should remain fatherless," explains the legend.

But I perceive—too late, I am afraid—that the case as above cited has little, if any, analogy with the case in hand. Ugolino ate his sons, and Haeckel—did not eat his son, Bathybius . . . ? Yet . . . Well—I give it up!

Memo.—Apply to the pellucid Solipsism of the Hylo-Idealists to get me out of this bog of the two sets of "sons"—the sons of Ugolino and the "first-born" of Haeckel. . . .

RELIGIOUS NOTES.

My Perplexities.

Here would be the right place for another Memo.—"To ask the Bishop of Canterbury," etc., etc. But his Grace, I fear, will refuse to enlighten me.

I have just finished reading the excellent article in Lucifer's French contemporary, L'Aurore, on the ten lost tribes of Israel. It would appear from the weighty proofs in the context that it is the English, the Anglo-Saxon nation, after all, which are those lost tribes. Well, may they prosper better in the bosom of Abraham than they are likely to in that of Christ. But there is a little difficulty in the way.

Ecclesiastical History teaches, and profane science does not deny, that since the days of Tiglath-Pileser, who carried three tribes and one-half a tribe beyond the Euphrates (2 Kings xv., 29; I

Chron. v., 26); and Shalmanaser, King of Assyria, who carried also beyond the Euphrates the rest of the tribes, there was "the end of the Kingdom of the ten tribes of Israel." In other words, no one heard of them any longer. "The tribes never did return," the good old Crudens tells us. Nor were they ever heard of. This was in 758 and 678 B. C.

But—and here comes the rub. If this is so, then the *Septuagint*—the ark of salvation of all the Protestant Churches and its hundreds of bastard sects—*is a living lie*, name and all. For what is the history of the famous *Septuagint?* Ptolemy Philadelphus, who lived some 250 years B. C., curious to read the Hebrew law in Greek, "wrote to Eleazar,* the high priest of the Jews, to send him *six men from each of the twelve tribes* of Israel to translate the law for him into Greek." Thus say Philo Judæus and Josephus, and add that *six men of each tribe were sent,* and the Septuagint written.

Query: Considering that ten tribes out of twelve had been lost nearly 400 years before the day of Ptolemy, and had *"never returned"*—whom did Eleazar send to Alexandria? Spooks may have been rife in those days as they are in ours?

PROFANE NOTES.

Perplexities (continued).

I have seen mediums (for "fire and flame phenomena" as they are called in America) take burning live coals in their hands and closing their fingers upon them never even get a burn. I have seen others handle red-hot and white-hot lamp-glasses, pokers, and have heard from several trustworthy eye-witnesses that the medium D. D. Home used to cool his countenance, when entranced, by burying his face in a bed of live coals in the grate of the fire-place, not a hair of his head being singed; and he took up handfuls of burning coals with naked hands and even gave them to other persons to hold—without any injury.

And having seen all this, and heard all this, what am I to think, when I find Isaiah saying (vi. 6), "Then flew one of the seraphims unto me, having *a live coal which he had taken with the* Tongs from off the altar."

Query: Why such precautions?

Why should a seraph need *tongs?* A seraph is higher than a common angel—for he is an angel of the highest order in the celestial hierarchy. Moreover, the plural of the word *seraph* means "burning, fiery," hence of the same nature as the fire. Shall we infer from this that spiritual mediums are of a still higher hierarchy than even seraphs?

---

* Or is it Ariamnes II.? For *historical* chronology *is* muddled up . . .

A Heathen Brother, a high graduate, writes: "This week a zealous *padri* pestered us with questions I could not answer. He clamoured to be told why, if we write after our names, 'M.A.'s' and 'B.A.'s,' we persist in believing various doctrines taught in the Purânas. 'How can you, O foolish Gentiles,' he exclaimed; 'Why should you, O god-forsaken, unregenerate idolaters,' he cried, 'believe that not only did your Brahmâ form birds from his vital vigour, sheep from his breast, goats from his mouth, kine from his belly, horses, deer and elephants from his sides, whilst from the hairs of his body sprang herbs, roots, plants, &c.; but even that sun and moon, fishes in the seas and fowls in the air, stones and trees, rivers and mountains, that all the animate and inanimate nature, in short, talks with your false god and praises, making *puja* (obeisance) to him!' What could I answer to this irate father, who called our sacred scriptures silly *fairy tales,* and proclaimed the supremacy of his religion over ours? Already visions of Jordan and baptism have begun to haunt my restless dreams. I cannot bear to be laughed at by one, the doctrines of whose religion seem so infinitely superior in matter of Science to ours. Advise and help me. . . . "

I sent him in answer "the Book of Common Prayer," according to the use of the Church of England. I marked the "Morning Prayer," No. 8, the *Benedicite, Omnia Opera,* for him with a red cross, to read to his *padri* at the first opportunity. For there, filling over three columns, we find: "Oh, ye Sun and Moon, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him for ever." "Oh, ye Whales and Wells, Seas and Floods, Fowls of the Air, and all ye Beasts and Cattle, Mountains and Green things upon the Earth, Ice and Snow, Frost and Cold, Fire and Heat, &c., &c., bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him for ever."

This, I believe, will moderate the zeal of the good missionary. The difference between the fish and fowls, cereals, plants and whales, and other marketable product of sea and land of the Heathen, and those of the Christian, seems quite imperceptible to an unbiased mind.

Decidedly, the promise of the Jewish God, "I shall give you the heathen for your inheritance," seems premature.

THE ETERNAL MIRACLE*

IN these grim and frost bitten days I love to remember how the wandering Tea-Table had a little butterfly farm in a sunny bay window late last autumn. There amid the falling leaves, the patter and gurgle of rain on low eaves, or the solemn drip from the

* We have given the above title to this article which is an extract from "Tea Table Talk" first printed by Wm. Q. Judge in *The Path* for February, 1888.

black pines on to the graves of June roses—there we watched some gauze-imprisoned worms, brave fellows in black velvet and gold vesture, working out the eternal miracle of Death-in-Life for the instruction of occultists in embryo. Even brighter skies, the pipe of winds and autumn banners flaring from the hills, could not tempt us out while the wonder was still in hand. The captives fed grossly on milkweed for a while, journeyed, hobnobbed, regarded the world, reached a period of fevered activity in which they knew not pause nor rest, then found a secluded spot and concluded to remain there. Fierce was their anger at any fellow who drew near or disturbed them, savage on its own scale as the wrath of the lion, while they deposited their worldly store in the shape of a little white gluten, sparkling like saccharine crystals and exuded from the proboscis upon the gauze roof. I invite all occultists to consider these analogies: the gluten, quintessence of the worm, formed a link between two worlds. When sufficient had been deposited to form a tiny spike-like projection, the worm ceased to work it with the head and moved slowly over it until it could insert the spike into a minute opening in the end of the body or tail. Giving due time to the gluten to harden and become fixed there, (whatever impregnating office it might fill we know not), after several essays the worms finally let themselves gradually down until they hung suspended in air from the spike of gluten, now hard as a gravel granule and firmly rooted in the tail. Vibration after vibration ran through every coil now in double series, one series from head to tail, another from tail to head: occultists will recognize this universal movement. The vibrations increased in rapidity during a period of twenty-four hours, when at last a violent effort is visible and with body movement and quick head strokes combined the worm cracks open at the back, feverishly and rapidly "shuffles off this mortal coil" of black and gold, which falls to the ground, leaving a light green worm momentarily visible. Only momentarily; this renewed creature doubles itself up, joins head to tail, working the neck around the spike of gluten; the head falls off, the doubled up body is all fused together by the same vibratory movement, and in two minutes or less there hangs from the gauze an exquisite smooth green satin casket, which an exudation presently studs with gilt nails around its dome-shaped top, closing it, I know not how. The effort of these two minutes is really something terrible to witness, yet the work is accomplished with supreme ease after all, when we consider the marvelous consummation. This casket, erst the inner (second) body of the creature, is now in process of becoming a mere casement for the mysterious germ sleeping within. During two weeks it becomes more and more translucent, its fibre is gradually assimilated, and the bright wing markings and color dots of the third form are at last visible beneath the thin shell. Some fine morning towards noon (in some dozen observed) this shell cracks at the back, a winged, brilliant creature lets itself down from the shrivelling isinglass-like case,

slowly unfolds, like a flower, and like the flower clasps the stem; for still it grasps the case. Not at once does it relinquish the abandoned habit, remember.[1] All earthly dross must be purified from the creature of the skies. So while he vibrates still more tremulously than ever before, waving and trying his wings, there is a drip, as of life blood, from his quivering body. This over, he rests, and we ask, why does he not fly? Hours after, he is seen to suddenly lift his head. The divine thought has touched him! With instant recollection and power he rises, makes an exultant dash for the blue regions, and soars in ever widening circles, lost to us, discovered anew to life. Never have I seen any thing more inspired than the electric swiftness of that instinct, coming so suddenly to all. We have placed them on the pines in resinous sunshine, or upon the flower; they will not stir until they hear the soundless admonition; they wait for the ripe moment of the Law: so they never falter in that strong flight. We have lost sight of them, but wide-eyed Science has seen that they presently return to the terrestrial fields, and, full of heaven's sweet essences, have birth in other lives.

This stage of their journey, this visible passage from the first to the third form by means of an essential coupling or link, is most beautiful and typical. Go into your gardens when the year swings round again; gather milkweeds and captives; net them in airy gauze, and nature will teach you how the soul emerges from husk after husk. She will teach you Reincarnation; she will show what a broad scope of change is necessary and appointed to all growth; she will demonstrate that resistance to this Law on any plane is retardation, while as yet only an incipient, encrusting habit; is Death eternal when the habit becomes fixed in the petrified soul.

JULIUS.

FORLORN HOPE*

"Should a wise man utter vain knowledge
and fill his belly with the east wind?"
(*Eliphaz*, in *Job* xv. 2.)

IN days of far, far away Antiquity, namely, in 1886, a suggestive Theosophical Fable went the round of our circles, and found room in the March number of the *Theosophist* for that year. Its subject was a Society named "Harmony," born to investigate the music of the Spheres, and established in the far East. It had, tones for some three years, until gradually it succeeded in making ran the fable, a queer "instrument," to attune which a great genius

[1] See Jan. PATH, 1888, Page 290; on the relinquishment of intermediate forms. [See article, "Rays from the East," reprinted in THEOSOPHY for May, 1915.—ED. THEOSOPHY.]

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for July, 1888.

descended occasionally from the upper realms and made the instrument repeat the music of the spheres. It possessed also a president, who, in the great honesty and innocence of his heart, had been imprudent enough to boast of his possession, and had made the instrument sing to whomsoever came within the range of his vision: so much so, that finally the instrument was made quite cheap.

Then the *fabula* showed how the learned men of the West—who believed in neither genius, spheres nor the instrument—put their wise heads together, and finding that even if the instrument was no fiction, yet, as it was not built on any rules of the modern science of acoustics *known to them,* it had, therefore, no right to existence. Forthwith they concluded not to permit the music of the spheres to be played, least of all, believed in. So, goes on the fable, they "selected a smart boy, gave him a penny and asked him to go across the big water" and report upon what he would see in the "Harmonial Society."

"The smart boy went and looked at the instrument. But when he came there, it gave forth only discordant sounds, because his own soul was not in harmony with it. . . . Then the President took out his book of incantations and tried every conjuration to force the genius of the spheres to play a tune for the smart boy. But the genius would not come. So the smart boy took his travelling bag and went home, and told his fathers in learning that he had not seen the great genius and did not hear the music of the spheres. The learned men put their heads together a second time . . . and the result was they said that the smart boy was wise, and that the President of the Harmonial Society was—mistaken."

Or, in less polite, but still more untruthful words, the president, his society, and his "instrument" especially, were all either fools, frauds or both. The charge of "humbug and imposture" against the "Harmonial" Society was thus proven, and became *un fait accompli.* Henceforth that idea was photographed in the shallow drums that public opinion mistakes for the heads of its leaders, and it became indelible.

From that time forward adjectives such as "fraud, deception and imbecility" became attached to the "Harmonial" Society and followed it everywhere, like a tail follows its comet. The theory struck deep roots in the hearts and minds of many non-theosophists and became at last part of the very being of the British public. This proverbially "fair minded" body had heard one side of the question and—felt satisfied. Its pioneer-gossips, full of Christian charity and 5 o'clock tea, had ransacked the contents of the "smart boy's" travelling bag. Having greedily fed themselves upon the adulterated food which was like heavenly manna for their insatiate stomachs, they differentiated, and then shared it with all who were hungry and thirsty for such celestial nourishment. Thus, Grundy's cackle-twaddle was kept up in loud and authoritative tones for some three years, until gradually it succeeded in making "Theosophy" a byword synonymous with every kind of iniquity. Theosophy was set up as a target for daily slander, verbal and printed; it was proclaimed a fallen idol whose feet of clay had at

last given way, and it was hourly advertised dead as a door nail and buried for ever. But, lo and behold! a dark shadow has suddenly fallen across the face of this sweet and secure hope. . . . .

It is quite touching to read certain jeremiads in the daily papers, to learn the pathetic regrets expressed with regard to the suspected instability of public opinion. The attitude of certain social circles is visibly changing, and something will have to be done once more to bring Theosophy into disrepute, if we would not see it resurrect like Lazarus out of his tomb. For, as time goes on, more than one enemy begins to express grave doubts. Some suspect that the theosophical Jezebel may, after all, have been merely a victim: Job, visited by permission of Karma—or if so preferred, by that of the enthroned Almighty, granting to his Son-Satan full liberty to test the endurance of his "uprighteous servant" of the land of Ug (Job, ii. 1-8). Others perceived that though Satan-Grundy, using the venomous tongues of the multitudes, had covered "Job" with sore boils, yet the patient had never collapsed. Theosophy was neither knocked off its feet by the mighty wave of calumny and defamation, nor did it show any signs of agony. It was as firm on its legs as ever. *Mirabile dictu* and acme of impudence!—cried its enemies. Why here it is again, and it begins to raise its voice louder than ever! What does the creature say? Listen . . . .

"Aye, right honourable, as well as right dishonourable opponents and enemies. Your Mrs. Grundy has filled me with *wrinkles* as Satan filled Job, but these are witness only against herself. 'He teareth me in his wrath, who hateth me'—but I hate no one and only pity my blind slanderers. 'He gnasheth upon me with his teeth'—and I only smile back. 'Mine enemy sharpeneth his eyes upon me,' and I offer to lend him mine to allow him to see clearer. 'They have gaped upon me with their mouth wide open'; and, like Jonas swallowed by the whale, I have found no uncomfortable quarters for philosophical meditation inside my enemy, and have come out of his voracious stomach as sound as ever! What will you do next? Will you smite me 'upon the cheek reproachfully'? I shall not turn to you the other, lest you should hurt your hand and make it smart and burn still worse; but I shall tell you a story, and show you a panoramic view, to amuse you. . . ."

See how the enemies of the Theosophical Society and its leaders look disconcerted! Hear how in the bitterness of their heart, for sweet hopes frustrated, they writhe and have not even the decency to conceal their bad humour at what they foolishly regard as the *triumph of theosophy*. Truly has the east wind filled their—brains, and vain knowledge has disagreed most decidedly with the learned men of the West! For what do *they* do? Listen once more.

Fearing lest their appetite for devouring and assimilating the carrion food snatched from the beaks of the Bombay ravens by the

"smart boy" should slacken, the wise men of learning have devised, it appears, a fresh little plan to strangle Theosophy. If one can believe the *Birmingham Post* (the very sincere *daily* which lets out the secret), the big-wigs of the very Christian "Victoria Institute" have not forgotten the fable of the "monkey and the cat." The "monkeys" of science, had selected for some time past the paws of their ablest cat to draw the chestnuts for them out of the theosophical fires, and had hoped thereby to extinguish the hated light for ever. Read and judge for yourself the bit of interesting information contained in the above mentioned daily for June 15th of the present year of grace. Says the loquacious writer:—

> Even Science herself, generally so steadfast in her progress, so logical in her conclusions, so firm in her pursuit of a sure result, has been made to tremble on her lofty perch by the shock given her by the discourse of Sir Monier Williams at the Victoria Institute, last Monday. Sir Monier Williams is Boden Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford, and regarded as the first Sanskrit scholar in the world. The announcement of the choice made by the learned professor of the subject of his discourse as being that of "Mystical Buddhism in Connection with the Yoga Philosophy of the Hindoos," had created an immense degree of interest amongst the learned portion of the society of London. It was firmly believed that Sir Monier Williams had chosen the subject for the express purpose of demolishing the errors and superstitions of a creed which has crept in upon us by degrees from the intrigues of sundry impostors who have worked upon the love of the marvellous so inherent to human* nature to establish themselves as prophets of a new doctrine. This was the opinion of all learned men in general, and they had been watching with great eagerness for a refutation from the pen of Sir Monier Williams of all the "sleight-of-hand principles," as the experiments of the Theosophists were called. This refutation in writing had never come, and therefore it was with redoubled interest that the speech which would demolish the audacious pretensions of the conjuring philosophers was waited for. What, then, was the surprise of the assembly of wise men when Sir Monier Williams, instead of denying, almost confirmed the truth of the assertions made by the Theosophists, and actually admitted that, although the science of modern Theosophy was imperfect, yet there are grounds for belief which, instead of being neglected as they have been by students of philosophy, ought to be examined with the greatest care.

A wise man, for once in his generation, this newly knighted lecturer! The greater the pity that this "first Sanskrit scholar in the world" (Professors Max Müller, Whitney, Weber and the *tutti quante*, hide your diminished heads!) knows so little of Buddhism as to make the most ludicrous mistakes. Perchance, there was a *raison d'être* for making them. Both his lectures, at any rate those about which some fuss has been made, and one of which was noticed in the 8th number of Lucifer—both these lectures were delivered before very Christian audiences at Edinburgh and before the "Philosophical Society of Great Britain," whose members *have to be Christians*. Nevertheless, one fails to see why a little more correct information about the difference between *Raj Yoga* and *Hatha-Yoga* should not have been offered to that audience? Or why again it should be told that, in the days of Gautama

* The writer in his grief seems to have forgotten his commas. The subject, also, to produce the desired effect should have been handled in more grammatical English.

Buddha, Buddhism "set its face against all solitary asceticism," and "had no occult, no esoteric system of doctrine which it withheld from ordinary men"—both of which statements are historically untrue. Worse still. For having just mentioned at the opening of his lecture, that Gautama had been "reborn as Buddha, the enlightened," that he had reached *Parinibbâna* or the great, *highest Nirvana;* that he had passed through the highest states of *Samadhi,* the practice of which confers the "six transcendent faculties," *i. e.,* clairvoyance, or "the power of seeing all that happens in every part of the world," "knowledge of the thoughts of others, recollection of former existences. . . . and finally the supernatural powers called *Iddhi,"* the professor coolly asserted that it was never stated "that Gautama ever attained to the highest . . . Yoga of Indian philosophy—union with the Supreme Spirit!" Such a statement may flatter the preconceptions of a few bigots among a Christian audience, but we question whether it is not one entirely unworthy of a true scholar, whose first duty it is to be impartial in his statements, lest he should mislead his hearers.

While Theosophists should feel deeply thankful to Sir Monier Williams for the excellent advertisement their society and philosophy have received at his hands, the Editors of Lucifer would fail in their duty were they to leave unnoticed several self-contradictions made in this lecture by "the greatest Sanskrit scholar in the world." What kind of definite idea can an audience have on Buddhism when it hears the two following statements, which directly contradict each other:—

"He (Buddha) was ever careful to lay down a precept that the acquisition of transcendent human faculties was restricted to the perfected Saints, called Arhats." This, after just stating that Buddha had never himself "attained to the highest yoga," that he was no Spiritualist, no Spiritist,* but "a downright *Agnostic"*—he, the "Buddha," or the Enlightened!!!

The outcome of this extraordinary lecture is that Gautama Buddha had never reached even the powers of a simple modern Yogi. For such transcendent powers are allowed by the lecturer even in our present day to some Hindus. We quote again from the *Birmingham Post:*

The word Yoga, according to Sir Monier Williams, literally means union, and the proper aim of every man who practises Yoga is the mystic union of his own spirit with the one eternal soul or spirit of the universe, and the acquisition of divine knowledge by that means. This was the higher Yoga. But the lower practice seeks to abstract the soul from the body and the mind, and isolate it in its own essence. So may be acquired the inner ear, or clair-audience, by which sounds and voices may be heard, however distant; the inner eye, or clairvoyance, the power of seeing all that happens in every part of the world, and a knowledge of the thoughts of others. These

* Let us fondly hope so; and that Allan Kardec will not be placed by Sir Monier Williams one day on a higher level than Buddha.

acquirements have become developed into demonology* and various spiritual phenomena connected with that esoteric Buddhism which every schoolgirl is studying in secret nowadays. Long and persevering study of the great science will lead to the practice of twisting the limbs, and of suppressing the breath, which latter faculty leads to the prolongation of existence under water or buried beneath the earth. Many Hindoo ascetics have submitted to interment under this influence. Colonel Meadows Taylor once assisted at the burial of a man who professed to be able to remain nine days beneath the earth without drawing breath during that time. Colonel Taylor, determined that no deception should be used, was present during the ceremony of interment, and, after seeing the man duly covered with earth, sowed seed upon the grave, which, being duly watered, sprang up with luxuriance long before the expiration of the nine days'[1] probation. More than this, the grave was watched day and night by two English sentinels, so that there really appears no reason to suppose that any deception could possibly be practised, the more so that Colonel Taylor himself had chosen the place of burial, which circumstance precludes all idea of subterranean passages, which had been suggested in other cases of the like nature. At the end of the nine days the grave was opened with all due solemnity. The buried man was found in the same position in which he had been laid down, and when he opened his eyes his first enquiry was for his bowl of rice, adding that he felt hungry, and that he would be glad to eat. Professor Monier Williams did not quote this example —he dwelt more lengthily upon the absorption of the mental faculties rather than on that of the physical powers. He went on to explain how internal self-concentration may lead to the acquisition of supernatural gifts, and enable a man to become invisible at will, to appear at any spot however apparently distant, to gain absolute power over himself and others, to bring the elements into subjection, and to suppress all desires. A Yogi, when thus befitted, can float in the air, fly through space, visit the planets and stars, create storms and earthquakes, understand the language of animals, ascertain what occurs in every part of the earth, and even enter into another man's body and make it his own. The Professor then related how a powerful Yogi had once entered into the dead body of a king, and had governed the country for three whole weeks. It is still believed that certain of the Eastern sages can eject the ethereal body through the pores of the skin, and render this phantasmal form visible in distant places. The effect produced by the Professor's discourse may readily be imagined. Here was justification in full of the theories, hitherto so scorned and abused, of Colonel Olcott, Mr. Sinnett, and Madame Blavatsky. Here was almost an avowal of belief in the possibility of the truth, if not in the truth itself, of the realisation of that recognition of the powers of darkness from which all Christian souls are taught to shrink with horror and dismay. The Professor seemed so well aware of the impression produced by his discourse that, as if feeling himself compelled to add a few words by way of excuse for the extreme lengths to which he had been led, he added by way of conclusion that he was induced to doubt whether the practices assumed to be possible to the Theosophists would stand the light of European science. "But nevertheless the subject must not be dismissed as unworthy of consideration. It furnishes," said Sir Monier Williams in conclusion, "a highly interesting topic of enquiry, especially in its bearing on the so-called Spiritualism, neo-Buddhism, and Theosophy of the present day. The practices of magnetism, mesmerism, clairvoyance, &c., have their counterparts in the Yoga system of the Hindoos prevalent in India more than two

---

* This is *entirely false*. Any one who would like to acquire the proofs that this statement is a gratutitous calumny has only to read theosophical literature, and even the last numbers of Lucifer. The methods described belong to *Hatha Yoga*, and are very injurious and dangerous; still, even this is no *demonology*, but simply a lower form of Yoga. The Theosophical Society has fought from the beginning against these methods. Its teachers went dead against it, and even against some forms of mediumship, such as sitting for materialization—the necromancy of the Bengal Tantrikas!

[1] We have always believed the period to have been 40 days, and this is borne out by the planting of the seed. Surely for seed to sprout and grow "with luxuriance" in *nine* days would be almost as great a "nine days' wonder" as the interment of the Yogi?

thousand years ago." At the end of the lecture a vote of thanks was proposed by the Bishop of Dunedin, who undertook, as it were, the apology of the doctrine expounded (scarcely to the satisfaction of all present), and who thought it his duty to point out the distinction between Christianity and Buddhism—the former reliant upon God's mercy, the latter on the efforts of man to work out his self-deliverance from evil. I have dwelt thus long upon the subject of the great professor's discourse because the world of thought—of scientific research—having found at last a footing in London society, these things are talked of and examined with reflection, and without detriment to the flow of small-talk which used formerly to occupy the whole attention of the world of fashion.

Thus ends the plaint of the Birmingham Jeremiah. It speaks for itself, and we thank the writer for letting, so naïvely, the cat out of the bag. The real "cat," however, the one on which the "monkey" of the "Victoria Institute" and other scientific establishments had placed such optimistic hopes, has played its colleagues false. It has turned tail at the last moment, and has evidently declined the loan of its paw to draw from the fire the too hot chestnuts for the benefit of the scientific "researchers" of the day. Like Balaam, whom the King of Midian would willingly have bribed to curse the Israelites, Sir Monier Monier-Williams, K.C.I.E., D.C.L., LL.D., Boden Professor of Sanskrit at the University of Oxford (where, "for reasons of ill-health," he can no longer lecture, but lectures for our benefit elsewhere)—has not cursed the Theosophists and their teachings—but has blessed them. Alas! Alas!

"Compelled to praise!" It cannot be
By prophet or by priest;
Balaam is dead? . . . . yet don't we see
And hear, perchance—his beast? . . . .

ADEPT, INITIATE, MAHATMA*

In what respect does a Master differ from an Adept, an Initiate, or a Mahâtmâ? These terms seem to be used rather loosely and as if interchangeable; strictly speaking, how would they rank, and what qualifications and powers are the adjunct of one who has earned the name Master?

W. O. Judge.—It is not possible to clear up these difficulties of language. They are all—except *Mâhâtmâ*—interchangeable. That term of course stands alone, but when it is put into English as "Great Soul," then those two words begin the confusion again, because *Soul* is not definite. A Master is an Adept and an Adept is a Master, and both are Initiates. For my part I see no way of settling the question, and personally I do not want it settled yet; I want no strict limitations in terms until the English language has become scientific.

* This answer by Mr. Judge to the question asked was first printed in *The Theosophical Forum* of August, 1895. The title used is our own.—[ED. THEOSOPHY.]

Forum

SOCIAL AND LABOR CONDITIONS*

Ages of blind, usurious laws have brought the world to ruin. Our struggle for physical existence prevents the full study of Divine Wisdom. Would it not be wise for Theosophists to unitedly advocate improved conditions, say through the Labor Exchange system or some such method? One may ask, why should we strive for that which would place us on the higher planes of thought or feeling when conditions are so unfavorable?

William Q. Judge.—I cannot admit the two first assertions of the question. The world is not yet in ruins; the struggle for existence does not prevent the full study of Divine Wisdom. The study of self, the attempt to carry out the old direction, "Man, know thyself," does not depend on human laws, nor upon conditions. The body may be in prison, or engaged in incessant labor, but the soul and mind cannot be bound by environment unless we ourselves allow it. The soldier does not seem to be in a business or conditions favorable to self-development, but even while in his sentry-box he can still think on the matter and thus study it—for study does not mean mere reading of books and writing of compositions. People fail in their efforts to study truth just because they start out by formulating a need for different conditions, or by insisting on having surrounding objects in just such a position and of such a quality before they will begin the work. They are wrong.

Inasmuch as Divine Wisdom and the nature of the Self are not material, physical things or objects, they are not to be confounded with mere physical surroundings. Hence material environments should not be permitted to confuse or throw back the man who desires to study that Divine Wisdom.

Again, as all things down to the most gross from the most ethereal are a part of Divine Wisdom, it is a mistake to try and destroy or put away because one does not presently like them, the very conditions in which under Karma one is obliged to study Divine Wisdom.

The second part of the question contains a proposition for the T. S., or Theosophists as a body, to advocate some one or other of the many proposed reforms. This should never be done. The T. S. is free and independent of all such reforms, while it applauds all good results. But it does not follow that the reformatory measures are the best. Nor has the last word been spoken on those subjects. It is very wise and right to alter if we can the oppressive conditions about the poor or others. But so long as the philosophy, the religion, and the view of life held by the people are wrong, just so long all reforms will be temporary. The people must be altered in thought and heart, and then conditions will right themselves. I therefore strongly oppose any propositions looking toward binding the T. S. down to any system of reform or of legislation. Individual members can do as they please about it so long as they do not involve the Society.

---

* This answer by Mr. Judge to the question asked was first printed in *The Theosophical Forum* of February, 1896. The title used is our own [Ed. Theosophy.]

ON THE LOOKOUT

What is it that prevents so many writers from pushing their reasoning to its ultimate conclusions? Is it fear? Is it "convention"? Or does their stoppage some way along the line of logical deduction, as if it were the end, represent the limitations of the minds they have made for themselves? Surely if the human mind "is a bundle of ideas" in regard to life, which we have adopted, and in accordance with which we think and act, we cannot pass beyond their range; we must get our mental exercise within the bounds of the enclosure we have set ourselves. But one would think that a good mind might extend itself and grow, if the line of reasoning taken is logically worked out; the step beyond the ideas previously held is merely an extension of, and an infallibly logical deduction from, the ideas already proven sound.

Some statements by the Rev. A. C. Dixon in *"What Happens After Death"* (Funk & Wagnalls Co.) make us wonder how this clergyman ever escaped realizing the necessity of reincarnation as a fact in nature. The very illustrations he uses to demonstrate the immortality of the soul should have told him the story. For Nature, in her processes, fairly *shouts* reincarnation—the coming and going, metempsychosis. He demonstrates continuing existence after death to his own satisfaction—and stops there, never seeing the obvious conclusion of reincarnation, or reembodiment. For instance:

> The immortality of the soul is, first of all, suggested by Nature. We plant a seed in the Springtime, and in Autumn we reap the same kind of seed. The thing that continues in the seed is the vital force, the life. The particles may be different, but the life is the same. Take out the life, and it is all dead matter. The reappearance of this life in bud and leaf and flower at least suggests that the life mental, moral and spiritual in us may continue after death.

Why not follow the course of the seed, an almost perfect illustration, Mr. Dixon, to its logical and actual reembodiment? Is not reincarnation the *Law* of Nature, and are not we humans a part of, and one with, Nature? To quote further:

> Suggested by Nature, taught by universal consciousness, the immortality of the soul is confirmed by observation. If you will turn to any first-class book on mental philosophy you will find instances in which memory has grown stronger while the body has grown weaker. There are cases on record where page after page in foreign languages, long forgotten, have been repeated by men on beds of sickness. A friend told me that, when he was thrown from a horse and almost killed, the panorama of his past life came before him; impressions that had faded from memory, while he was physically strong, were revived during the time of weakness.

It would almost seem as if Mr. Dixon were presenting Theosophical, instead of Christian arguments! But soon he begins to buttress his conclusions with Biblical quotations, the ultimate resort of limited minds that hold to the belief that the Bible is the actual word of God; and there is an end to Mr. Dixon's present possibilities of mind extension. The following quotation fairly represents the *impasse* to which blind *belief* brings its devotees:

> In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke xvi.) it is made plain that reason, memory and imagination continue to exist after the death of the body. The rich man in Hades uses the word "therefore"; he reasons. Abraham said to him, "Son, remember." And his request that Lazarus shall be sent back to earth, to rise from the dead and startle his brethren into repentance, shows that imagination still exists. *This testimony of Jesus that the reason, memory and imagination of the wicked continue to exist after death is final and settles the question once for all.*

The italics are our own!

George Bernard Shaw has another little surprise for his readers in his latest Preface. With the publication of "Androcles and the Lion," "Overruled," and "Pygmalian," Mr. Shaw takes opportunity to break into his views in the peculiar way he has adopted since he found that plays pay better than essays. The dramatist is muzzled in a sense, having to speak entirely through the mouths of his characters, whose ideas he may or may not father. Mr. Shaw, who considers his works as immortal as Shakespeare's (if not more so), is not going to let future commentators be in any doubt about what he meant, so he overcame this difficulty with the Prefaces that made his plays famous. Into his Preface he puts as much of his opinions as, for the time being, he has formulated. It is interesting to trace the evolution of those opinions. Mr. Shaw is, apparently, so earnest and ardent in his beliefs whatever they are, for the time being, that his jack-in-the-box changes of attitude are doubly fascinating.

He hurled the Nietzschean philosophy of individualism at us in the manner of Thor with his thunderbolts, with anathema on our foolish philistine heads for our deliberately stupid prejudices against accepting them and moulding our lives upon them. It is not so long ago that in a Preface to "Fannie's First Play," he expounded the theory that children like to make a noise, and grown people have nerves that render it impossible for them to put up with it to any great extent, ergo, children should be segregated in well managed institutions where they would be allowed to develop their individualism unchecked by the quieter inclinations of their elders.

After such a flagrant denial of the necessity for unselfish toleration, for the give and take which in family life furnishes such satisfactory material for character-building, it is a surprise to us to have the same gentleman hurling Christianity at us with the same finality of judgment. Oh, not Christianity as it is marred in the churches, but in the pure and undiluted message of Christ, or, more correctly, as we have it in the Bible. It is a little strange that Shaw, after his wide reading, accepts the doctrine that has been given by all the Great Teachers as particularly and specially Christ's doctrine. However, he is widely read and he will make people think, so we are grateful to him for this latest phase.

He has come to the belief that Christ did make a scientific discovery about the nature of man and the universe; that the ethics he promulgated are really, transcendentalism aside, the best thing in the world for us to practise; that our trouble is that we have been afraid to take him at his word. We believed that what he said was very good—but in fact it was shown very plainly while he was here that he was too good for this world, and we have continued to take that attitude ever since he left. Mr. Shaw says "He was much less of a fool in practical matters than we have all thought him." He says, "The first common mistake to get rid of is that mankind consists of a great mass of religious people and a few eccentric atheists. It consists of a huge mass of worldly people and a small percentage of people deeply interested in religion." He says, "Christ is a fact, a force like electricity, only needing the invention of suitable political machinery to be applied to the affairs of mankind with revolutionary effect." He scathingly dismisses the idea of salvation except through individual effort; he laughs to scorn the idea of "one great atonement and one great redeemer to compound for the sins of the world once for all."

It is disappointing that this man of most fluidic mind and facile pen, and a courage that has seemed at times to resemble audacity, has so narrowed his outlook as apparently to recognise only one of the Teachers as such—One who came with a very limited message compared with that brought to us by Those who came in 1875. Is it quite fair to disregard the fact that without the enlightenment They brought to us; without the breadth of mind that has developed from those writings, Mr. Shaw's writings would have had little chance of reaching a public. Religious opinions have broadened and outgrown the little creeds that lie tucked away like the clothes of

childhood, quite as useless, still preserved, however, and the world is, for the most part unfortunately unconscious of what has caused the growth. With such knowledge as is available now, it is no longer necessary for us to do good to them that despitefully use us, with never a question as to the—why? Since the advent of H. P. B. and W. Q. J. we need no longer see through a glass darkly, but may be face to face with the divine plan. We now should have put away childish things.

The recent perpetration and publication of two neurotic novels dealing with the "occult" will do little to impress the minds of thinking people with the force of the truths in which they dabble.

"Heaven's dew-drop glittering in the morn's first sunbeam within the blossom of the lotus, when dropped on earth becomes a piece of clay; behold, the pearl is now a speck of mire."

How easily may the ideas that contain the hope of salvation for the world become soiled by injudicious handling. Reincarnation in the hands of the purveyor of sensationalism may be as revolting as that spurious article known as "love" in the quack novel.

"Twilight," a posthumous work of Frank Danby, contains an inglorious mixture of spiritualism, reincarnation, insanity, morphine, with other features to make the judicious grieve, too many to enumerate. Any person with a grain of common sense unfortunate enough to have stumbled upon this work without previous introduction to the imperishable truths that are travestied therein will perforce cast the book aside and turn his self-respecting back upon these ideas on which the regeneration of the world depends. Those who investigate Theosophy from a morbid desire to peer into the weird and "supernatural" are not likely to benefit themselves or anyone else by their results, and they alone would be influenced by this sort of book.

"Julius Le Vallon," by Algernon Blackwood, is a fictional account of what is called within, the Memory Game. The story hangs on the fact of a recognition between "friends of a million years." In it reincarnation plays around with the wildest freaks of an unreined imagination dealing with a pot-pourri of elementals, Great Experiments, Jura Mountains, superhumanizing a child in the womb, (whatever that may mean), voyaging back and back through time, hypnotism, sleep-walking, all mixed up in a dubious sort of hash with the commonplaces of life and love. Need one say that after a perusal of such pages one yearns for the sweet, wholesome, and sane, and that without previous, better knowledge of these subjects one would be very unlikely to be attracted to the occult in this way.

It has been said that a sense of responsibility is the beginning of Brotherhood. The following little poem by Katharine Park Lewis, printed in a recent issue of *Life,* brings out, like a cry from the heart, a sense of our Karmic responsibility—whoever, or whatever, the "Lord" she speaks of may mean to her. Could it be other than "the God within"?

THE SEA UNCROSSED.

We go upon our even, selfish ways,
  Unroused from routine and from thoughtlessness,
While over there the bitter passing days
  Turn young hearts old with heaven's helplessness.

Dulled by success to sleek content, and blind
  To suffering beyond our half-closed eyes,
We give a little gold—if we're inclined—
  And think we've done our share to still their cries.

Since peace, content, achievement do not bring
  Awakening to our dull hearts of wood,
Rouse us, O Lord, through strife and suffering,
  Rouse us through want and shame—to Brotherhood!